

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----	x	
	:	
In re	:	Chapter 11
	:	
DELPHI CORPORATION, <u>et al.</u> ,	:	Case No. 05-44481 (RDD)
	:	
Debtors.	:	(Jointly Administered)
	:	
-----	x	

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

I, Evan Gershbein, being duly sworn according to law, depose and say that I am employed by Kurtzman Carson Consultants, LLC, the Court appointed claims and noticing agent for the Debtors in the above-captioned cases.

On February 8, 2006, I caused to be served the document listed below (i) upon the parties listed on Exhibit A hereto via electronic notification:

- 1) Debtors' Omnibus Response to Objections to Their Motion for Order Under 11 U.S.C. Sections 105 and 363 Authorizing the Debtors to Implement a Key Employee Compensation Program (Docket No. 2210) [a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B]

On February 9, 2006, I caused to be served the document listed below (i) upon the parties listed on Exhibit C hereto via overnight delivery, (ii) upon the parties listed on Exhibit D hereto via electronic notification, and (iii) upon the parties listed on Exhibit E hereto via postage pre-paid U.S. mail:

- 2) Debtors' Omnibus Response to Objections to Their Motion for Order Under 11 U.S.C. Sections 105 and 363 Authorizing the Debtors to Implement a Key Employee Compensation Program (Docket No. 2210) [a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B]

Dated: February 10, 2006

/s/ Evan Gershbein

Evan Gershbein

Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on this 10th day of February, 2006, by Evan Gershbein, personally known to me or proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person who appeared before me.

Signature : /s/ Amy Lee Huh

Commission Expires: 3/15/09

EXHIBIT A

COMPANY	CONTACT	ADDRESS1	ADDRESS2	CITY	STATE	ZIP	PHONE	FAX	EMAIL	PARTY / FUNCTION
Brown Rudnick Berliack Israels LLP	Robert J. Stark	Seven Times Square		New York	NY	10036	212-209-4800	212-209-4801	rstark@brownrudnick.com	Indenture Trustee
Capital Research and Management Company	Michelle Robson	11100 Santa Monica Blvd	15th Floor	Los Angeles	CA	90025	310-996-6140	310-996-6091	mlfr@capgroup.com	Creditor Committee Member
Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt & Mosle LLP	Steven J. Reisman	101 Park Avenue		New York	NY	10178-0061	212-696-6000	212-697-1559	sreisman@cm-p.com	Counsel for Flextronics International USA, Inc.
Davis Polk & Wardwell	Donald Bernstein	450 Lexington Avenue		New York	NY	10017	212-450-4092	212-450-3092	donald.bernstein@dpw.com	Postpetition Administrative Agent
Delphi Corporation	Sean Corcoran, Karen Craft	5725 Delphi Drive		Troy	MI	48098	248-813-2000	248-813-2670	sean.p.corcoran@delphi.com karen.j.craft@delphi.com	Debtors
Electronic Data Systems Corp.	Michael Nefkens	5505 Corporate Drive MSIA		Troy	MI	48098	248-696-1729	248-696-1739	mike.nefkens@eds.com	Creditor Committee Member
Flextronics International	Terry Zale	6328 Monarch Park Place		Niwot	CO	80503	303-652-4853	303-652-4716	terryzale@flextronics.com	Counsel for Flextronics International
Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.	Richard Lee Chambers, III	6501 William Cannon Drive West	MD: OE16	Austin	TX	78735	512-895-6357	512-895-3090	trey.chambers@freescale.com	Creditor Committee Member
FTI Consulting, Inc.	Randall S. Eisenberg	3 Times Square	11th Floor	New York	NY	10036	212-247-1010	212-841-9350	randall.eisenberg@fticonsulting.com	Financial Advisors to Debtors
Groom Law Group	Lonie A. Hassel	1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW		Washington	DC	20006	202-857-0620	202-659-4503	lhassel@groom.com	Counsel for Employee Benefits
Hodgson Russ LLP	Stephen H. Gross	152 West 57th Street	35th Floor	New York	NY	10019	212-751-4300	212-751-0928	sgross@hodgsonruss.com	Counsel for Hexcel Corporation
Honigman Miller Schwartz and Cohn LLP	Frank L. Gorman, Esq.	2290 First National Building	660 Woodward Avenue	Detroit	MI	48226-3583	313-465-7000	313-465-8000	fgorman@honigman.com	Counsel to General Motors Corporation
Honigman Miller Schwartz and Cohn LLP	Robert B. Weiss, Esq.	2290 First National Building	660 Woodward Avenue	Detroit	MI	48226-3583	313-465-7000	313-465-8000	rweiss@honigman.com	Counsel to General Motors Corporation
IUE-CWA	Henry Reichard	2360 W. Dorothy Lane	Suite 201	Dayton	OH	45439	937-294-7813	937-294-9164	hreicharduecwa@aol.com	Creditor Committee Member
Jefferies & Company, Inc.	William Q. Derrough	520 Madison Avenue	12th Floor	New York	NY	10022	212-284-2521	212-284-2470	bderrough@jefferies.com	UCC Professional
JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.	Richard Duker, Gianni Russello	270 Park Avenue		New York	NY	10017	212-270-0426	212-270-0430	richard.duker@jpmorgan.com gianni.russello@jpmorgan.com	Postpetition Administrative Agent
JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.	Vilma Francis	270 Park Avenue		New York	NY	10017	212-270-5484	212-270-4016	vilma.francis@jpmorgan.com	Prepetition Administrative Agent
Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel LLP	Gordon Z. Novod	1177 Avenue of the Americas		New York	NY	10036	212-715-9100	212-715-8000	gnovod@kramerlevin.com	Counsel Data Systems Corporation; EDS Information Services, LLC
Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel LLP	Thomas Moers Mayer	1177 Avenue of the Americas		New York	NY	10036	212-715-9100	212-715-8000	tmayer@kramerlevin.com	Counsel Data Systems Corporation; EDS Information Services, LLC
Kurtzman Carson Consultants	James Le	12910 Culver Blvd.	Suite I	Los Angeles	CA	90066	310-751-1511	310-751-1561	jle@kccllc.com	Noticing and Claims Agent:
Latham & Watkins LLP	Robert J. Rosenberg	885 Third Avenue		New York	NY	10022	212-906-1370	212-751-4864	robert.rosenberg@lw.com	UCC Professional
Law Debenture Trust of New York	Daniel R. Fisher	767 Third Ave.	31st Floor	New York	NY	10017	212-750-6474	212-750-1361	daniel.fisher@lawdeb.com	Indenture Trustee
Law Debenture Trust of New York	Patrick J. Healy	767 Third Ave.	31st Floor	New York	NY	10017	212-750-6474	212-750-1361	patrick.healy@lawdeb.com	Indenture Trustee
McDermott Will & Emery LLP	David D. Cleary	227 West Monroe Street		Chicago	IL	60606	312-372-2000	312-984-7700	dccleary@mwe.com	Counsel for Recticel North America, Inc.
McDermott Will & Emery LLP	Mohsin N. Khambati	227 West Monroe Street		Chicago	IL	60606	312-372-2000	312-984-7700	mkhambati@mwe.com	Counsel for Recticel North America, Inc.
McTigue Law Firm	J. Brian McTigue	5301 Wisconsin Ave. N.W.	Suite 350	Washington	DC	20015	202-364-6900	202-364-9960	bmctigue@mctiguelaw.com	Counsel for Movant Retirees and Proposed Counsel for The Official Committee of Retirees
McTigue Law Firm	Cornish F. Hitchcock	5301 Wisconsin Ave. N.W.	Suite 350	Washington	DC	20015	202-364-6900	202-364-9960	conh@mctiguelaw.com	Counsel for Movant Retirees and Proposed Counsel for The Official Committee of Retirees
Mesrirow Financial	Melissa Knolls	321 N. Clark St.	13th Floor	Chicago	IL	60601	800-453-0600	312-644-8927	mknoll@mesrirowfinancial.com	UCC Professional
Morrison Cohen LLP	Joseph T. Moldovan, Esq.	909 Third Avenue		New York	NY	10022	212-735-8603	917-522-3103	jmoldovan@morrisoncohen.com	Counsel for Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Michigan
Northeast Regional Office	Mark Schonfeld, Regional Director	3 World Financial Center	Room 4300	New York	NY	10281	212-336-1100	212-336-1323	newyork@sec.gov	Securities and Exchange Commission
O'Melveny & Meyer LLP	Robert Siegel	400 South Hope Street		Los Angeles	CA	90071	213-430-6000	213-430-6407	rsiegel@omm.com	Special Labor Counsel
O'Melveny & Meyer LLP	Tom A. Jerman, Rachel Janger	1625 Eye Street, NW		Washington	DC	20006	202-383-5300	202-383-5414	tjerman@omm.com	Special Labor Counsel
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation	Jeffrey Cohen	1200 K Street, N.W.	Suite 340	Washington	DC	20005	202-326-4020	202-326-4112	garick.sandra@pbgc.gov eflie@pbgc.gov	Counsel for Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation

COMPANY	CONTACT	ADDRESS1	ADDRESS2	CITY	STATE	ZIP	PHONE	FAX	EMAIL	PARTY / FUNCTION
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation	Ralph L. Landy	1200 K Street, N.W.	Suite 340	Washington	DC	20005-4026	2023264020	2023264112	landy.ralph@pbgc.gov	Chief Counsel for the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation
Phillips Nizer LLP	Sandra A. Riemer	666 Fifth Avenue		New York	NY	10103	212-841-0589	212-262-5152	sriemer@phillipsnizer.com	Counsel for Freescale Semiconductor, Inc., f/k/a Motorola Semiconductor Systems
Rothchild Inc.	David L. Resnick	1251 Avenue of the Americas		New York	NY	10020	212-403-3500	212-403-5454	david.resnick@us.rothschild.com	Financial Advisor
Seyfarth Shaw LLP	Robert W. Dremluk	1270 Avenue of the Americas	Suite 2500	New York	NY	10020-1801	2122185500	2122185526	rdremluk@seyfarth.com	Counsel for Murata Electronics North
Shearman & Sterling LLP	Douglas Bartner, Jill Frizzley	599 Lexington Avenue		New York	NY	10022	212-8484000	212-848-7179	dbartner@shearman.com jfrizzley@shearman.com	Local Counsel to the Debtors
Simpson Thatcher & Bartlett LLP	Kenneth S. Ziman, Robert H. Trust, William T. Russell, Jr.	425 Lexington Avenue		New York	NY	10017	212-455-2000	212-455-2502	kziman@stblaw.com rtrust@stblaw.com wrussell@stblaw.com	Prepetition Administrative Agent
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP	John Wm. Butler, John K. Lyons, Ron E. Meisler	333 W. Wacker Dr.	Suite 2100	Chicago	IL	60606	312-407-0700	312-407-0411	jbutler@skadden.com jlyonsch@skadden.com rmeisler@skadden.com	Counsel to the Debtor
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP	Kayalyn A. Marafioti, Thomas J. Matz	4 Times Square	P.O. Box 300	New York	NY	10036	212-735-3000	212-735-2000	kmarafio@skadden.com tmatz@skadden.com	Counsel to the Debtor
Spencer Fane Britt & Browne LLP	Daniel D. Doyle	1 North Brentwood Boulevard	Tenth Floor	St. Louis	MO	63105	314-863-7733	314-862-4656	didoyle@spencerfane.com	Counsel for Movant Retirees and Proposed Counsel for The Official Committee of Retirees
Spencer Fane Britt & Browne LLP	Nicholas Franke	1 North Brentwood Boulevard	Tenth Floor	St. Louis	MO	63105	314-863-7733	314-862-4656	nfranke@spencerfane.com	Counsel for Movant Retirees and Proposed Counsel for The Official Committee of Retirees
Stevens & Lee, P.C.	Chester B. Salomon, Constantine D. Pourakis	485 Madison Avenue	20th Floor	New York	NY	10022	2123198500	2123198505	cp@stevenslee.com cs@stevenslee.com	Counsel for Wamco, Inc.
Togut, Segal & Segal LLP	Albert Togut	One Penn Plaza	Suite 3335	New York	NY	10119	212-594-5000	212-967-4258	altogut@teamtogut.com	Conflicts Counsel to the Debtors
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP	Martin J. Bienenstock, Esq.	767 Fifth Avenue		New York	NY	10153	212-310-8000	212-310-8007	martin.bienenstock@weil.com	Counsel to General Motors Corporation
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP	Michael P. Kessler, Esq.	767 Fifth Avenue		New York	NY	10153	212-310-8000	212-310-8007	michael.kessler@weil.com	Counsel to General Motors Corporation
Wilmington Trust Company	Steven M. Cimalore	Rodney Square North	1100 North Market Street	Wilmington	DE	19890	302-636-6058	302-636-4143	scimalore@wilmingtontrust.com	Creditor Committee Member/Indenture Trustee

COMPANY	CONTACT	ADDRESS1	ADDRESS2	CITY	STATE	ZIP	COUNTRY	PHONE	FAX	EMAIL	PARTY / FUNCTION
Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossman	Hannah E. Greenwald	1285 Avenue of the Americas		New York	NY	10019		212-554-1411	2125541444	hannah@blbglaw.com	Counsel for Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma; Public Employees's Retirement System of Mississippi; Raifeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenfornds ABP
Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossman	John P. Coffey	1285 Avenue of the Americas		New York	NY	10019		212-554-1409	2125541444	sean@blbglaw.com	Counsel for Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma; Public Employees's Retirement System of Mississippi; Raifeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenfornds ABP
Cohen, Weiss & Simon LLP	Joseph J. Vitale	330 West 42nd Street		New York	NY	10036		212-356-0238	646-473-8238	jvital@cwssny.com	Counsel for International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agriculture Implement Works of America (UAW)
Gorlick, Kravitz & Listhaus, P.C.	Barbara S. Mehlsack	17 State Street	4th Floor	New York	NY	10004		212-269-2500	212-269-2540	bmehlsack@qkllaw.com	Counsel for International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Unions No. 663; International Association of Machinists; AFL-CIO Tool and Die Makers Local Lodge 78, District 10; International Union of Operating Engineers Local Union Nos. 18, 101 and 832
Grant & Eisenhofer P.A.	Geoffrey C. Jarvis	1201 North Market Street	Suite 2100	Wilmington	DE	19801		302-622-7000	302-622-7100	gjarvis@ggelaw.com	Counsel for Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma; Public Employees's Retirement System of Mississippi; Raifeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenfornds ABP
Grant & Eisenhofer P.A.	Jay W. Eisenhofer	45 Rockefeller Center	650 Fifth Avenue	New York	NY	10111		212-755-6501	212-755-6503	jeisenhofer@gelaw.com	Counsel for Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma; Public Employees's Retirement System of Mississippi; Raifeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenfornds ABP
Grant & Eisenhofer P.A.	Sharan Nirmul	1201 North Market Street	Suite 2100	Wilmington	DE	19801		302-622-7000	302-622-7100	snirmul@gelaw.com	Counsel for Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma; Public Employees's Retirement System of Mississippi; Raifeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenfornds ABP
Gratz, Miller & Brueggeman, S.C.	Jill M. Hartley	1555 N. RiverCenter Drive	Suite 202	Milwaukee	WI	53212		414-271-4500	414-271-6308	jh@previant.com	Counsel for International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Unions No. 663; International Association of Machinists; AFL-CIO Tool and Die Makers Local Lodge 78, District 10
Gratz, Miller & Brueggeman, S.C.	Matthew R. Robbins	1555 N. RiverCenter Drive	Suite 202	Milwaukee	WI	53212		414-271-4500	414-271-6308	mrr@previant.com	Counsel for International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Unions No. 663; International Association of Machinists; AFL-CIO Tool and Die Makers Local Lodge 78, District 10

COMPANY	CONTACT	ADDRESS1	ADDRESS2	CITY	STATE	ZIP	COUNTRY	PHONE	FAX	EMAIL	PARTY / FUNCTION
Gratz, Miller & Brueggeman, S.C.	Timothy C. Hall	1555 N. RiverCenter Drive	Suite 202	Milwaukee	WI	53212		414-271-4500	414-271-6308	tch@previant.com	Counsel for International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Unions No. 663; International Association of Machinists; AFL-CIO Tool and Die Makers Local Lodge 78, District 10
International Union of Operating Engineers	Richard Griffin	1125-17th Avenue, N.W.		Washington	DC	20036		202-429-9100	202-778-2641	rgriffin@iuoe.org	Counsel for International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Unions No. 663; International Association of Machinists; AFL-CIO Tool and Die Makers Local Lodge 78, District 10; International Union of Operating Engineers Local Union Nos. 18, 101 and 832
Lowenstein Sandler PC	Ira M. Levee	1251 Avenue of the Americas	18th Floor	New York	NY	10020		212-262-6700	212-262-7402	ilevee@lowenstein.com	Counsel for Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma; Public Employes's Retirement System of Mississippi; Raifeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenfonds ABP
Lowenstein Sandler PC	Michael S. Etikin	1251 Avenue of the Americas	18th Floor	New York	NY	10020		212-262-6700	212-262-7402	metkin@lowenstein.com	Counsel for Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma; Public Employes's Retirement System of Mississippi; Raifeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenfonds ABP
Meyer, Suozzi, English & Klein, P.C.	Lowell Peterson, Esq.	1350 Broadway	Suite 501	New York	NY	10018		212-239-4999	212-239-1311	lpeterson@msek.com	Counsel to United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers, International Union (USW), AFL-CIO
Nix, Patterson & Roach, L.L.P.	Bradley E. Beckworth	205 Linda Drive		Daingerfield	TX	75638		903-645-7333	903-645-4415	bbeckworth@nixlawfirm.com	Counsel for Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma; Public Employes's Retirement System of Mississippi; Raifeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenfonds ABP
Nix, Patterson & Roach, L.L.P.	Jeffrey J. Angelovich	205 Linda Drive		Daingerfield	TX	75638		903-645-7333	903-645-4415	jangelovich@nixlawfirm.com	Counsel for Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma; Public Employes's Retirement System of Mississippi; Raifeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenfonds ABP
Nix, Patterson & Roach, L.L.P.	Susan Whatley	205 Linda Drive		Daingerfield	TX	75638		903-645-7333	903-645-4415	susanwhatley@nixlawfirm.com	Counsel for Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma; Public Employes's Retirement System of Mississippi; Raifeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenfonds ABP

COMPANY	CONTACT	ADDRESS1	ADDRESS2	CITY	STATE	ZIP	COUNTRY	PHONE	FAX	EMAIL	PARTY / FUNCTION
Schiffin & Barroway, LLP	Michael Yarnoff	280 King of Prussia Road		Radnor	PA	19087		610-667-7056	610-667-7706	myarnoff@sbclasslaw.com	Counsel for Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma; Public Employees's Retirement System of Mississippi; Raifeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenfonds ABP
Schiffin & Barroway, LLP	Sean M. Handler	280 King of Prussia Road		Radnor	PA	19087		610-667-7706	610-667-7056	shandler@sbclasslaw.com	Counsel for Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma; Public Employees's Retirement System of Mississippi; Raifeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenfonds ABP
United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers, International Union (USW), AFL-CIO	David Jury, Esq.	Five Gateway Center	Suite 807	Pittsburgh	PA	15222		412-562-2549	412-562-2429	djury@steelworkers-usw.org	Counsel to United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers, International Union (USW), AFL-CIO

EXHIBIT B

SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP
333 West Wacker Drive, Suite 2100
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 407-0700
John Wm. Butler, Jr. (JB 4711)
David E. Springer (DS 9331)
John K. Lyons (JL 4951)
Ron E. Meisler (RM 3026)

- and -

SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP
Four Times Square
New York, New York, 10036
(212) 735-3000
Kayalyn A. Marafioti (KM 9632)
Thomas J. Matz (TM 5986)

Attorneys for Delphi Corporation, et al.,
Debtors and Debtors-in-Possession

Delphi Legal Information Hotline:
Toll Free: (800) 718-5305
International: (248) 813-2698

Delphi Legal Information Website:
<http://www.delphidocket.com>

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----	X	
	:	
In re	:	Chapter 11
	:	
DELPHI CORPORATION, <u>et al.</u> ,	:	Case No. 05-44481 (RDD)
	:	
Debtors.	:	(Jointly Administered)
	:	
-----	X	

DEBTORS' OMNIBUS RESPONSE TO OBJECTIONS TO THEIR MOTION
FOR ORDER UNDER 11 U.S.C. §§ 105 AND 363 AUTHORIZING THE
DEBTORS TO IMPLEMENT A KEY EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION PROGRAM

Delphi Corporation and certain of its subsidiaries and affiliates, debtors, and debtors-in-possession in the above-captioned cases (collectively, "Delphi," the "Company," or the "Debtors"), respectfully submit this omnibus response (the "Response") to the objections filed to their Motion For Order Under §§ 105 And 363 Authorizing the Debtors To Implement A Key Employee Compensation Program (the "KECP Motion").

Preliminary Statement

Since the filing of the KECP Motion on October 8, 2005, as part of the commencement of their chapter 11 cases, the Debtors have exhaustively negotiated with the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors (the "Creditors' Committee," the "Committee," or "UCC") and considered the views of the objectors concerning the motion. At the Creditors' Committee's request, the Debtors have agreed to postpone until the July 27, 2006, omnibus hearing, those parts of the KECP Motion relating to annual incentive payments for periods after June 30, 2006, emergence cash awards, and equity participation in the reorganized entity. Accordingly, the only part of the KECP before the Court at the February 10, 2006, hearing is a revised, performance-based annual incentive program (the "Revised Annual Incentive Plan" or "Revised AIP") for the six-month period ending June 30, 2006.¹

¹ As a result of the Debtors' discussions with the Creditors' Committee, the Debtors agreed to forego a planned AIP program for the fourth quarter of 2005, which was to have covered the first three months of the Debtors' chapter 11 cases. This decision was based on the fact that, as a result of the Debtors' agreement to adjourn the KECP Motion from its original hearing date in November 2005 to the first quarter of 2006, the fourth quarter 2005 performance quarter was fully performed prior to the agreement between the Debtors and the Creditors' Committee regarding the form and substance of the revised AIP program. Accordingly, the Revised AIP incentive program presently before the Court has been reduced to an aggregate payment pool, at target performance, of approximately \$20.6 million, not more than \$5.7 million of which may be paid to the most senior-level (Delphi Strategy Board, or "DSB") executives. This result, standing
(cont'd)

For its part, the Creditors' Committee has agreed to the "form and substance" of the Debtors' proposal, and it has objected only to the Debtors' decision to proceed with implementation of the Revised AIP now, before labor negotiations have been "successfully concluded."² The Debtors respectfully submit that this and the few other objections to the Revised AIP now remaining should be overruled. At the outset, the evidence is unchallenged that the Revised AIP now before the Court is, in all material respects, of a kind with Delphi's prepetition programs and the annual incentive programs of the Debtors' industry peers and other Fortune 1000 companies. Thus the Revised AIP now before the Court qualifies as an "ordinary course" transaction within the meaning of section 363(c) of the Code. Accordingly, the Court need now do no more than declare as much, which would allow the Debtors to proceed to implement the Revised AIP.³

Even were the Court to consider the Revised AIP a transaction "other than in the ordinary course of business," within the meaning of section 363(b)(1) of the Code, the objections raised against it are unavailing. Neither the Creditors' Committee nor the other objectors have quarreled with or submitted evidence challenging the process by which the Debtors came to approve the Revised AIP. They also have not questioned that the Debtors have established a

(cont'd from previous page)

alone, represents an approximate one-third reduction in the planned expenditures for the AIP program for the first performance period.

² The Creditors' Committee should not be able to bootstrap its own request to adjourn consideration of the AIP-portion of the KECP from the November 28, 2005, omnibus hearing to the February 10, 2006, hearing (while the deadline for the filing of section 1113/1114 motions was deferred from December 20, 2005, to at least February 17, 2006), into a justification for further delay, especially given that the Debtors not only agreed to defer the balance of the KECP until the July 27, 2006, omnibus hearing but also to resolve every concern the Committee raised regarding the form or substance of the Revised AIP.

³ Delphi has already implemented ordinary course incentive programs for executives in non-Debtor affiliates and subsidiaries, as well as for its non-executive salaried workforce.

valid purpose for their proposed use of estate property, nor have they come forward with evidence to rebut the Debtors' showing that the decision to proceed now with the Revised AIP was made on an informed basis, in good faith, and in an honest belief that doing so is in the best interests of the estate. Accordingly, on this record, there is no basis to question the Debtors' business judgment, much less for the Court to override that judgment and come to a different business judgment in discharging its function as an "overseer of the wisdom with which the bankruptcy estate's property is being managed by the . . . debtor-in-possession," as mandated by the Court of Appeals in Orion Pictures Corp. v. Showtime Pictures Corp. (In re Orion Pictures Corp.), 4 F.3d 1095 (2d Cir. 1993).

There is also no legitimate record basis on which to label the Revised AIP unfair or unreasonable. To the contrary, the Creditors' Committee specifically disclaims any objection to the substance of the Revised AIP, which it acknowledges has resulted from the Debtors' "good faith in-depth discussions" with the Committee "regarding the conceptual form and substance of a proper performance-based incentive plan." (UCC Obj. at 2.) In reaching that conclusion, the Committee benefited from the advice of one of the leading experts in the field of executive compensation, Pearl Meyer of Steven Hall & Partners, the Committee's professional advisor. The other objectors should be taken to concur in the Committee's and Mrs. Meyer's judgments in this respect, for they have not produced any evidence challenging the merits of the plan.

The objections, then, boil down to two principal categories: the unions' contention (which the Creditors' Committee has recently elected to echo) that the Revised AIP should not be approved before the Debtors' negotiations with its labor unions have been "successfully concluded," and the Securities Class Action Lead Plaintiffs' objection that the Court should not

approve a plan that purportedly allows estate property to be paid to those who may have engaged in the accounting irregularities that are the subject of their class-action lawsuit.

With regard to the first objection, the evidence shows that Delphi's senior management, the Delphi Board of Directors' Compensation and Executive Development Committee (the "Compensation Committee"), and the full Board of Directors all carefully considered the costs and benefits to the estates in deciding to proceed with the Revised AIP now. And while the Debtors acknowledge that proceeding with the Revised AIP now may make negotiations with the unions harder than they would have been had the Debtors capitulated and agreed to arbitrarily deprive their executive workforce of basic market-based compensation, it is speculative, to say the least, whether approval of the limited Revised AIP now would, in fact, "endanger critical negotiations with the Debtors' unions," as the Creditors' Committee suggests. (UCC Obj. ¶ 7.)⁴ Even were that the case, the Debtors cannot—and the Court should not—countenance efforts by some stakeholders in these chapter 11 cases to hold hostage one population in the Debtors' human capital workforce (i.e., its salaried executives) to force a resolution acceptable to those same stakeholders of legacy obligations and uncompetitive labor contracts affecting another population of the Debtors' human capital workforce (i.e., its unionized hourly workers). This is especially true when the only element of the KECP actually before the Court is an ordinary course incentive program based on specific corporate, divisional, and personal performance

⁴ This argument is belied by the reality that the Debtors' labor contracts and legacy costs associated with its hourly unionized workforce can only be modified by agreement or by this Court's determination that the Debtors qualify for relief under sections 1113 and 1114 of the Code. Neither of these approaches to resolution of one of the Debtors' reorganization hurdles carries with it either a legal or equitable justification for this Court to intervene and withhold market-based compensation from the Debtors' 466 executives covered by the Revised AIP.

targets, the form and substance of which has been negotiated with and approved by the Creditors' Committee.

In all events, the Debtors' management and its Board assessed these concerns and took them into account in deciding to proceed. They evaluated these concerns in the context of facts they know about the history, status, and prospects of the Debtors' ongoing negotiations with the unions and General Motors Corporation and in light of a host of other considerations, including an assessment of the probable damage to the Debtors' estates they believe would flow from further delay in setting for their executive corps reasonable, incentive-based compensation—an integral and non-severable element of the Debtors' basic compensation package offered their executives. The Debtors' management and the Board also weighed in the balance the fact that their 466 domestic executives provide critical global leadership to an enterprise that spans six continents, that employs more than 185,000 people, and that had global revenues in 2004 of nearly \$27 billion. That their decisions resulted from a conservative, thoughtful, and balanced effort to take into consideration the host of considerations that confront the Debtors in these chapter 11 cases finds proof in the fact that these very same decision makers simultaneously took action, as part of the development of the KECP, to eliminate certain prepetition long-term incentive programs and previously approved and disclosed retention programs. In the end, the Debtors' ultimate conclusion to proceed now with the limited Revised AIP is a classic business judgment that falls comfortably within the range of discretion the Code leaves to debtors-in-possession.

The Securities Class Action Lead Plaintiffs' objection is also misplaced. The framers of the KECP and the Board's Compensation Committee took as a premise, in light of the investigation conducted by the Board's Audit Committee into the matters about which these

litigants complain, that any executive remaining at Delphi should be entitled to participate in the KECP. Moreover, the Debtors have adopted rigorous prophylactic measures—once again, supported by the Creditors' Committee—to insure that KECP benefits are not paid to, or retained by, individuals who engaged in wrongdoing against the Company.

In further support of the Response, the Debtors particularly represent as follows:

I.
STATEMENT OF FACTS

A. The Creation Of Delphi And Its Legacy Labor Costs

1. For many years, most of what are now the Debtors' businesses were conducted through various subsidiaries and divisions of GM. In the 1990s, however, GM decided to reorganize and then to divest itself of its automotive components businesses. Pursuant to that plan, GM caused Delphi to be separately incorporated as a wholly-owned subsidiary and, effective January 1, 1999, transferred its various automotive component businesses to Delphi, and it later distributed the stock of Delphi to GM's existing shareholders, thereby "spinning off" Delphi as a separate publicly-traded company. Pursuant to a series of agreements between Delphi and GM, Delphi assumed the assets and related liabilities of GM's automotive components businesses, and GM and Delphi allocated various assets, liabilities, and responsibilities related to those business between them. (Decl. of Mark R. Weber ("Weber Decl.") ¶ 4.)⁵

⁵ The evidence supporting the Motion is found in the separately-filed declarations of Mark R. Weber, Delphi's Executive Vice President, Operations, Human Resource Management & Corporate Affairs; John D. Opie, Delphi's Lead Independent Director; and Nick Bubnovich, Senior Consultant, Watson Wyatt Worldwide, Delphi's outside executive compensation consultant; and the Supplemental Declaration of Mark W. Weber. These witnesses were examined at deposition on February 2-3, 2006. The Debtors propose to

(cont'd)

2. The great majority of Delphi's domestic employees traditionally have been and today are represented by unions. Of the more than 46,000 people whom Delphi employed in the United States as of December 31, 2005, approximately 32,000 (or about 70%) are engaged on an hourly basis. Over 95% of these employees are represented by 49 different international and local unions. (Weber Decl. ¶ 5.)

3. As part of its separation agreements with GM, Delphi was required to assume the terms and conditions of the collective bargaining agreements that GM had negotiated with its unions. As a consequence, today Delphi is the only domestic auto supplier governed by labor agreements patterned on those between the "Big Three" automotive manufacturers (GM, Ford, and Chrysler) and their unions. The majority of the Debtors' legacy collective bargaining agreements not only provide for wages that are well above market, but they also require Delphi to provide substantial health and welfare pension benefit plans, retiree health care, and other benefits. As a result, the Debtors presently compensate their hourly production workers an average of almost \$64 per hour, including benefits and legacy liabilities. This level is nearly three times higher than the hourly labor rates of Delphi's U.S. peer companies. The result is that Delphi is disadvantaged in its ability to compete with its domestic peers in the automotive parts business on the basis of cost. (Weber Decl. ¶ 8.)

4. The collective bargaining agreements also impose a variety of significant operating restrictions on Delphi. For example, the Company may not permanently lay off idled workers. The result has been that the number of hourly employees receiving nearly full pay and benefits but who are on non-productive status has been in the several thousands. The collective

(cont'd from previous page)

offer these declarations in support of their direct case at the hearing on February 10, 2006, and to make the declarants available for live cross and redirect examination at that time.

bargaining agreements also limit Delphi's ability to exit non-strategic, unprofitable operations, thereby forcing the Company to continue incurring fixed labor costs, even in the event of plant closings or wind-downs. In 2004, Delphi incurred more than \$170 million in wages and benefits costs associated with hourly employees in non-working, unproductive status. With the decline of business conditions in the overall domestic auto industry, these conditions will only worsen and the numbers of and costs associated with non-productive hourly workers will only increase.

(Weber Decl. ¶ 9.)

B. The Responsibilities And Compensation Levels Of Delphi's Executive Workforce

5. The responsibilities of the Debtors' executive corps extend beyond the Debtors to include the entirety of Delphi's global enterprise, both debtor and non-debtor entities, with duties that in many instances reach across product lines. The Debtors' 466 domestic executives provide global leadership to a worldwide enterprise doing business on six continents, that employs more than 185,000 people, and that had global revenues in 2004 of nearly \$27 billion. (Weber Decl. ¶¶ 6-7.) Delphi's executive workforce not only has management responsibility for the Debtors' domestic workforce of about 46,000, but it also responsibility for management of the 140,000 Delphi employees (representing about 75% of the total workforce) who are employed outside the United States.

6. In contrast to the benefits enjoyed by the Debtors' hourly employees, total compensation for the Debtors' executive workforce has remained stagnant or has fallen, in comparative terms, during the past few years. (Weber Decl. ¶¶ 11-12; Decl. of Nick Bubnovich ("Bubnovich Decl.") ¶¶ 8-9.) For example, the DSB is comprised of most of the Company's officers and many of its senior-most executives. Under the Company's prepetition compensation program, the actual total compensation earned by members of the DSB was well under the market median, falling below the 25th percentile of total compensation when compared to

similarly-situated individuals, both in the industry in general, and Delphi's Fortune 100 corporate peers. So, too, with respect to the Company's non-DSB executives: although Delphi targeted total compensation for non-DSB executives at market-competitive levels, actual total compensation for this group fell below the 25th percentile when compared to similarly situated individuals, both in the industry in general, and Delphi's Fortune 100 corporate peers. (Bubnovich Decl. ¶¶ 10-11.)

7. When the petitions in these cases were filed on October 8, 2005, therefore, Delphi's hourly workers enjoyed actual compensation levels at levels well above their market peers, while the total compensation of the Company's executive workforce was below competitive levels. (Weber Decl. ¶¶ 8, 10-12; Bubnovich Decl. ¶¶ 9-11.)

C. Development Of The Key Employee Compensation Program

8. In developing the KECP, the Debtors took into consideration certain well-established principles relating to employee compensation. In deciding whether to accept or keep a job, employees consider the employer's entire "employment proposition," that is, the mix of tangibles (compensation and benefits) and intangibles (employer's prospects, career path, work content, work relationships, work/life balance, etc.) offered by the employer, adjusted by the risk that the employer will not be able to deliver on the proposition. As an employer faces increased financial distress, its employment proposition becomes impaired as employees face greater risk of losing their jobs and general uncertainty about their futures increases. The deeper in distress the employer the fewer the tools and choices it has to positively affect the employment proposition it offers existing and prospective employees. (Bubnovich Decl. ¶ 13; Decl. of John D. Opie ("Opie Decl.") ¶¶ 6-8.) Moreover, when financial distress results in a chapter 11 filing, employer decisions often become subject to court approval. A court's review of those decisions thus speaks to the "human capital" of the debtors' estates.

9. Under the Debtors' prepetition compensation program, Delphi incorporated the following individual elements as integrated components of its executive compensation plan: base salary, benchmarked against Delphi's industry peers and other Fortune 100 companies; an annual incentive plan (the "AIP"), under which executive incentive compensation payment opportunities were tied to the achievement of the Company's business plan and financial goals; and a long-term incentive plan (the "LTIP"), a program that provided incentive compensation payment opportunities in the form of cash (the "PAP") or equity (both stock options and restricted stock units), and designed to encourage Delphi management to achieve certain strategic corporate goals that, by their nature, took more than a year to complete. In addition, members of the Debtors' domestic executive workforce were eligible to receive retention grants under a program enacted in 2005. (Weber Decl. ¶ 14; Opie Decl. ¶¶ 5(a)-(c); Bubnovich Decl. ¶¶ 12(a)-(c).)

10. As events progressed toward the filing of these cases, Delphi took steps to protect the enterprise's assets by developing a key employee compensation program that would keep the key executives focused on maximizing the Debtors' financial performance and maintain alignment of their interests with those of the Debtors' stakeholders. (Bubnovich Decl. ¶¶ 14-20; Opie Decl. ¶¶ 9, 11, 13-14; Weber Decl. ¶ 13.)

11. In August 2005, Delphi began an evaluation of the Debtors' existing compensation structure and incentive plans in the context of a possible restructuring. With input from the Company's financial, compensation, and legal advisors, including Watson Wyatt Worldwide ("Watson Wyatt") and the Debtors' counsel, Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP ("Skadden," and, collectively, the "Advisors"), this evaluation was intended as a reassessment of the "employment proposition" that the Company could offer its executive

workforce in light of current U.S. and marketplace economic realities. Delphi gave consideration not only to overall costs in financial terms, but also to ensuring that the appropriate employees were included and that they were assigned appropriate levels of compensation in light of the Debtors' goals. Throughout, the Debtors held in mind their duty to manage the estate's assets in a fiscally responsible manner so as to maximize stakeholder recoveries. For that reason, the KECP was not simply a managerial exercise, but the product of careful consideration by the Compensation Committee and the Advisors. (Opie Decl. ¶¶ 9-10, 13; Bubnovich Decl. ¶¶ 13-18.)

12. The KECP takes as a principle that the Company should provide market-competitive compensation opportunities designed to motivate its executive workforce to perform for, and not simply remain employed by, the Debtors. To ensure that the program assists the Company in achieving its overall business plan, the program incorporates the use of measurable performance milestones sufficient to properly monitor and control short-term risk. The costs to the Debtors of the new plan are estimated at no greater than those previously borne by the Company in connection with its prior compensation package. The costs also are comparable to those approved by courts in the case of chapter 11 companies of similar size. The Debtors specifically considered particular incentive programs implemented by other companies in chapter 11, including automotive industry suppliers Federal-Mogul Corp. and Hayes Lemmerz International, Inc., with the goal of creating an overall incentive program that incorporated the most effective components of each. (Bubnovich Decl. ¶¶ 19-20; Opie Decl. ¶¶ 11, 13-14.)⁶

⁶ This Court may take judicial notice of the fact that bankruptcy courts in the chapter 11 cases of other auto parts suppliers have authorized key employee retention and incentive plans. See, e.g., In re Collins & Aikman Corp., Case No. 05-55927 (SWR) (Bankr. E.D. Mich. Dec. 16, 2005) (approving KERP containing a retention and "success sharing" *(cont'd)*)

13. When the Debtors filed their petitions in these cases, they cancelled the AIP and the LTIP, with the exception of a vested portion of a PAP award for the 2003-2005 performance period, in an amount of less than \$3 million. The Debtors also cancelled the newly enacted retention awards program. Accordingly, members of Corporate Management saw their total compensation opportunities decrease precipitously upon the Debtors' entry into chapter 11, going from a total prepetition compensation plan composed of base salary, AIP and LTIP incentive compensation payment opportunities, and retention grants, to a post-petition compensation package consisting solely of base salary. (Weber Decl. ¶ 14.)

14. The KECP was intended to replace some, but not all, of the compensation opportunities lost by the Debtors' executive workforce when the Company filed for chapter 11 protection. As announced by the Debtors on the Petition Date, the KECP contains two basic components: the Revised AIP; and emergence awards, consisting of cash incentive-compensation payments and a percentage of the equity of the reorganized entity, conditioned upon the Debtors' successful reorganization (the "Emergence Incentive Compensation Plan"). (Weber Decl. ¶ 16; Bubnovich Decl. ¶ 21; Opie Decl. ¶ 15; KECP Mtn., ¶¶ 24-37, Ex. 1, at pp.2, 9-26.) The KECP Motion does not, however, propose any replacement for the discontinued retention grants; and modifies the terms and reduces the costs of the Debtors' substitute for the LTIP.

(cont'd from previous page)

plan); In re Meridian Automotives Systems—Composites Operations, Inc., Case No. 05-11168 (MFW) (Bankr. D. Del. Aug. 30, 2005) (approving KERP and annual incentive program); In re Tower Automotive, Inc., Case No. 05010578 (ALJ) (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. March 30, 2005) (approving KERP and annual incentive plan for certain senior executives); In re Hayes Lemmerz International, Inc., Case No. 01-11490 (MFW) (Bankr. D. Del. May 28, 2002) (approving "Critical Employee Retention Plan"); In re Federal Mogul Global, Inc., Case No. 01-10578 (RJN) (Bankr. D. Del. May 1, 2002) (approving, inter alia, a KERP).

15. The portion of the KECP now before the Court applies to the Debtors' domestic executive positions, 466 as of January 27, 2006, excluding by voluntary agreement the current Chairman and CEO, Robert S. ("Steve") Miller. For purposes of the KECP, the executives are divided into "bands" A through K, from lowest to highest levels of responsibility. The two highest bands include one member each: the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Mr. Miller, is in Band K, and the President and Chief Operating Officer, Rodney O'Neal, is in Band H (there are no Bands I or J for domestic executives). Band G includes Delphi officers and executive officers: the Debtors' Vice Chairman, David B. Wohleen, two Executive Vice Presidents, and 19 corporate and divisional Vice Presidents, all of whom are DSB members. The two domestic Vice Presidents with international assignments are in Band F. Bands A through E include various directors, executive directors, and other, more junior executives. Band A, the entry executive level, has 154 executives including, for example, 16 chief product engineers. (Weber Decl. ¶ 7; Opie Decl. ¶ 18; Bubnovich Decl. ¶ 38.)

D. Filing Of The KECP Motion And The Creditors' Committee's Due Diligence

16. Because of the importance of the Debtors' executive workforce to the reorganization of these Debtors' business, the Debtors decided to file the KECP Motion on October 8, 2005 (the "Petition Date"), with their other First Day motions. (Opie Decl. ¶ 12.)

17. A hearing on the KECP Motion was originally scheduled for the November 29, 2005, omnibus hearing, with all objections due no later than November 22, 2005.

18. On November 11, 2005, the Creditors' Committee delivered to the Debtors a 29-point due diligence request, which the Debtors have fulfilled to the Committee's satisfaction.

19. On November 14, 2005, and then again on December 13, 2005, January 19, 2006, January 31, 2006, and again on February 3, 2006, the Debtors agreed to adjourn the deadline for the Creditors' Committee to file its objections, if any, to the KECP Motion. The Debtors and the

Creditors' Committee agreed to the adjournment and a rescheduling of the KECP hearing so that the Committee could continue its due diligence and to allow further negotiations about the plan. (Weber Decl. ¶ 17; Supplemental Declaration of Mark R. Weber ("Weber Supp'l Decl.") ¶ 2; Opie Decl. ¶ 16; Bubnovich Decl. ¶ 26.)

20. At the end of December 2005, and at the Creditors' Committee's request, the Debtors also agreed to the Creditors' Committee's specific request to adjourn all aspects of the KECP Motion, other than an annual incentive plan for a period ending on June 30, 2006, to the July 2006 omnibus hearing, which is currently scheduled for July 27, 2006. (Weber Supp'l Decl. ¶ 3.)

21. As a result of these adjournments and extensions of time, the Creditors' Committee announced on Monday, February 6, 2006, that it has no objection to the "form and substance" of the Revised AIP, but it does not believe that "any AIP should be approved before labor negotiations have been successfully concluded." (UCC Obj. at 2.)

E. The Objections

22. Parties-in-interest other than the Creditors' Committee were required to file objections to the KECP Motion, if any, by November 22, 2005. As of the end of the day November 22, 2005, the Debtors had received four timely-filed objections: from the Wilmington Trust Company, in its capacity as Indenture Trustee; the United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers, International Union, AFL-CIO; the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America; and the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation. The Office of the United States Trustee also filed a timely objection.

23. On November 23, 2005, the Debtors received five additional, but untimely, objections and joinders from the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Union

No. 663 and the International Association of Machinists, AFL-CIO tool and Die Makers Local Lodge 78, District 10; JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A., in its capacity as administrative agent for itself and the secured lenders syndicate; the International Union of Operating Engineers Local Union Nos. 18, 101, and 832; the International Union of Electronic, Electrical, Salaried, Machine and Furniture Workers-Communications Workers of America; and the Teachers' Retirement System of Oklahoma, the Public Employees' Retirement System of Mississippi, Raiffeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H, and Stichting Pensioenfonds ABP, as Lead Plaintiffs in the Consolidated Securities Class Actions. (For the Court's convenience, a chart summarizing the principal objections raised by the Objectors is attached hereto as Exhibit A.)⁷

F. Summary of the KECP Provisions now before the Court

24. As a result of discussions between the Debtors and the Creditors' Committee, certain provisions of the Revised Annual Incentive Plan have been substantially refined and the details and operation of other aspects of the Revised AIP clarified. In particular, the following information has been provided:

⁷ The Debtors served discovery on most of the Objectors, and some Objectors served discovery of their own on the Debtors. In the end, the Debtors agreed to make available to all Objectors the information that they supplied to the Creditors' Committee or in response to whatever discovery was produced in connection with the KECP Motion. In response to the parties' various pre-hearing discovery requests, the Debtors produced over 5,000 pages of documents related to the KECP. Conversely, the Objectors produced some documents they believe are responsive to some of the Debtors' requests for clarification of the nature and scope of the Objections raised by these parties. The Debtors also produced the declarations of their supporting witnesses and made them available for deposition. Three union objectors also tendered declarations and are making their witnesses available for deposition before the hearing. The Debtors have been informed that neither the Creditors' Committee nor the other objectors intend to offer any other witnesses at the hearing, and the Creditors' Committee has also represented to the Debtors counsel that it does not intend to offer evidence of any kind.

- a. the names and employment positions of the Debtors' executives who currently are eligible to participate in the Revised Annual Incentive Plan ("Covered Employees");
- b. evidence making clear that the Audit Committee's investigation of the accounting issues underlying the Debtors' June 30, 2005, restatement of certain prior period financial statements, on the one hand, and the process by which the Compensation Committee formulated the KECP, on the other, were independent;
- c. the Debtors' first-period financial performance targets, both on a consolidated basis and by division;
- d. clarification of the performance metrics by which the Debtors' corporate- and division-level executives may become eligible for annual incentive compensation awards;
- e. refinement and clarification of the process by which each Covered Employee's incentive compensation award, if any, may be adjusted; and
- f. detailed safe harbor or prophylactic measures to make clear that the Company has reserved its right to withhold or recover any performance-based awards from Covered Employees, if any, who failed to act in good faith and in a manner the Company reasonably believes to be in or not opposed to the best interests of the Debtors. (Weber Decl. ¶¶ 17-19, 22-30; Weber Supp'l Decl. ¶¶ 2-3; see also Opie Decl. ¶¶ 17, 25-26.)

25. The provisions of the KECP now before the Court have been thoroughly reviewed and approved by Delphi's Compensation Committee. Moreover, the Board of Directors as a whole received a report on the status of the KECP negotiations on February 1, 2006, and the independent directors met separately and determined, after considering all the facts and circumstances of the case—including the views of various constituencies and the effects of

continuing uncertainty on the Debtors' executive corps—that the Debtors should proceed to hearing on the applicable provisions of the KECP Motion on February 10, 2006. (Opie Decl. ¶ 28.)

26. The Revised Annual Incentive Plan now before the Court provides the Debtors' executives with the opportunity to earn cash incentive payments based on the Debtors' achievement of certain levels of financial performance between January 1 and June 30, 2006, using targets and business metrics set by the Company, in consultation with its Advisors, and with input from the Creditors' Committee and its advisors. All members of the Debtors' domestic executive workforce (excluding by his voluntary agreement, the current Chairman and CEO, Mr. Miller) are eligible to participate in these opportunities. (Bubnovich Decl. ¶ 27; Opie Decl. ¶¶ 16-18.)

27. The Revised Annual Incentive Plan incorporates six-month performance cycles rather than the year-long periods used prior to the Petition Date, with the performance cycle now before the Court beginning on January 1, 2006, and ending on June 30, 2006. In making the decision to employ shorter cycles, the Debtors recognized the need not only to closely monitor their ongoing financial progress, but also to ensure that executive performance remains linked to the evolving demands of these chapter 11 cases. The use of abbreviated cycles permits the Debtors to anticipate and track more closely the potential effect of non-recurring or non-operational events that might otherwise affect the Debtors' ability to achieve their financial targets. The shortened periods likewise reflect the Debtors' awareness that the chapter 11 process itself introduces variables that make it more difficult to make long-term forecasts about the Debtors' financial performance. As a result of these modifications, the Debtors expect to be able to set corporate performance targets that are neither unattainably high—and which therefore

serve no real function—nor so low that eligibility for incentive compensation payments under the Revised Annual Incentive Plan become automatic. (Weber Decl. ¶¶ 18, 21; Opie Decl. ¶ 20; Bubnovich Decl. ¶ 36.)

28. The shorter periods also provide Covered Employees (and thus, the Debtors) with more incentive value than annual periods. By way of example, if the Debtors fall significantly short of their financial targets for any particular month, that shortfall only will affect the ability to meet the target for the six-month incentive cycle, not the entire year, and thus will affect only one-half of an executive's incentive opportunity for the year. Under the prepetition plan, one bad month might affect an executive's entire annual incentive-compensation opportunity. (The Debtors did not, however, implement shorter performance cycles (e.g., three months) because the costs associated with administering the plan on a quarterly or other basis would have outweighed the additional incentive value provided by the shorter periods.) (Bubnovich Decl. ¶ 37.)

29. Even if the Debtors achieve their performance targets, however, Covered Employees will not necessarily receive incentive compensation payment under the Revised Annual Incentive Plan. Instead, each Covered Employee also must maintain an acceptable level of personal achievement to qualify for incentive compensation payments. The individual performance of each Covered Employee will be evaluated annually by his or her supervisor or, in some cases, by a committee of senior executives. Any Covered Employee whose performance is deemed to be unacceptable will not be eligible for an incentive payment. (Weber Decl. ¶¶ 22, 26; Opie Decl. ¶¶ 19, 24; Bubnovich Decl. ¶ 34.)

30. In connection therewith, an executive's annual incentive compensation payment may be adjusted within a range of 0% to 200% of his or her target award opportunity, based on personal performance. (For DSB members, the positive adjustment is limited to 150% of the

executive's target payment opportunity.) Nevertheless, the net effect to the Debtors of these individual adjustments must be zero, i.e., a positive individual achievement adjustment for one executive must be counterbalanced by negative individual achievement adjustments for one or more other executives. Additionally, a DSB-level incentive payment adjustment cannot be funded by (or fund) an adjustment to a non-DSB-level payment, and vice versa. (Bubnovich Decl. ¶ 34; Weber Decl. ¶ 26.)

31. The Debtors' original KECP Motion proposed to employ EBITDAR-based performance targets. As a result of continuing discussions with the Creditors' Committee, the Debtors have refined the metric to be used in connection with the Revised Annual Incentive Plan. To obviate concern that it would be inappropriate for the Debtors to include in their pre-emergence earnings calculations for the Revised AIP those gains, if any, obtained as a result of the Debtors' ongoing negotiations with GM ("G") or the Debtors' labor unions ("U"), the Debtors have agreed to make explicit their intention to exclude these factors from their calculations. At the enterprise level, therefore, the Debtors will use "EBITDAR-UG," that is, "earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation, amortization, restructuring costs, but excluding earnings, if any, resulting from contractual negotiations with GM and the Unions," as the metric for calculating Revised Annual Incentive Plan payment opportunities. The enterprise-level target has been set at (\$80 million) and is derived from the Debtors' business plan—which forecasts positive EBITDAR for the six-month period—and has been reviewed by Delphi's Board of Directors. (Opie Decl. ¶¶ 21-22; Bubnovich Decl. ¶¶ 29, 32; Weber Decl. ¶¶ 18, 22.)

32. In consultation with the Creditors' Committee, the Debtors also have agreed to begin measuring corporate performance at the Debtors' divisional level for purposes of the Revised Annual Incentive Plan. The Debtors therefore will tie a portion of the incentive

compensation opportunities for division-level executives to the performance of that executive's particular division. Because the Debtors measure earnings only at the enterprise level, however, the Debtors will substitute an "Operating Income" metric ("OI") for "Earnings" at the division level. Accordingly, 50% of the incentive payment opportunities for division-level executives will be calculated on the basis of OIBITDAR-UG, and the remaining 50% will be calculated on the basis of EBITDAR-UG. The earnings targets for each division, also drawn from the Debtors' business plan, are as follows: Energy and Chassis, (\$44.2 million); Steering Division, (\$92.8 million); Thermal and Interior, (\$79.2 million); Electronics and Safety, \$193.0 million; Packard Electric, \$83.4 million; Product and Service Solutions, \$23.1 million; Automotive Holdings Group, (\$583.9 million); and Medical, \$0.3 million. (Weber Decl. ¶ 22, Ex. C; Opie Decl. ¶ 23; Bubnovich Decl. ¶¶ 30, 32, Ex. A.)

33. The enterprise- and division-level compensation payment opportunities will operate independently: achievement of the financial target at one level of the entity will fund the incentive payment opportunity for that level only, irrespective of the outcome for another entity level (or levels). For example, if a division achieves its threshold earnings target but the enterprise does not, Covered Employees in that division would be eligible only for their division-level incentive payment opportunities, and corporate-level Covered Employees would not receive incentive compensation payment. If a division and the enterprise both achieve their respective targets, Covered Employees in that division would be eligible for both components of their incentive compensation payments, and corporate-level employees become eligible for enterprise-level incentive payments. If the Debtors achieve their enterprise-level targets, but a division does not achieve its corresponding targets, all Covered Employees will be eligible for their enterprise-level payment opportunities, but Covered Employees in that division will not be

eligible for their division-level payments. (Opie Decl. ¶ 23; Weber Decl. ¶ 24; Bubnovich Decl. ¶ 33.)

34. The apportionment of incentive compensation payment opportunities by entity level is summarized below:

Executive	Portion Attributable to Achieving Corporate Target	Portion Attributable to Achieving Division Target
Corporate-level executive	100%	0%
Divisional executives (other than in the Medical Division)	50%	50%
Medical Division executive ⁸	30%	70%

(Weber Decl. ¶ 24.)

35. By adding division targets to the Revised Annual Incentive Plan, the Debtors have tightened the connection between individual performances and incentive payments at every level of the organization. This ensures that each Covered Employee's incentive compensation payment opportunities more accurately reflect the performance achievement opportunities available at his or her level of the entity itself. (Weber Decl. ¶¶ 23-24; Bubnovich Decl. ¶ 33.)

36. The potential incentive compensation payments have been reduced proportionately to reflect the shorter (six months versus annual) performance cycle. The thresholds, targets, and ceilings have been adjusted to take into account the views of the Creditors' Committee and its consultant (and are set forth in charts attached to the Supplemental Declaration of Mark R. Weber). As a result of discussions between the Debtors and the Creditors' Committee and its advisors, the Debtors have agreed that, unless the Debtors achieve at least 90% of their targets at the enterprise level, payouts will be less than half of the prorated

⁸ At present, there are no executives in the Medical Division. Among the reasons given by the last executive remaining in the division prior to his recent departure was dissatisfaction with compensation levels. (Weber Decl. ¶ 24 n.5.)

annual targets. At a 95% target attainment level, Covered Employees will be eligible for potential incentive awards of 75% of targets. One hundred percent of incentive awards become available only if and when the Debtors actually achieve 100% of their targets. (Weber Supp'l Decl. ¶ 9, Ex. 2.)

37. The Debtors and their compensation advisors estimate that the cost, at target, for the first six-month cycle of the Revised AIP for all eligible executive is approximately \$20.6 million. For members of DSB, the cost, at target, is \$5.7 million. The Debtors' estimates assume that all Covered Employees will remain with the Debtors for the entire performance period, and that all Covered Employees will meet the personal-performance requirements implemented under the plan. The target incentive compensation payment opportunities for Covered Employees under the Revised Annual Incentive Plan for the period January 1, 2006, through June 30, 2006, are outlined in the spreadsheet attached as Exhibit B to the Declaration of Nick Bubnovich. (Bubnovich Decl. ¶ 35; Weber Decl. ¶ 19.)

G. The Agreed Safe Harbor and Prophylactic Measures

38. As a result of negotiations with the Creditors' Committee, the Debtors have also agreed to impose strong and unprecedented safe harbor and prophylactic measures. (Weber Supp'l Decl. ¶ 4, Ex. 1.) In relevant part, a Covered Employee's incentive compensation award will be temporarily escrowed, pending a final determination whether those payments should be forfeited (pursuant to procedures and standards set forth below), if, in connection with conduct or transactions relating to the Covered Employee's employment or affiliation with the Debtors, any of the following occurs:

a. the Debtors assert a claim for relief, under the Code or other applicable law, against the Covered Employee;

b. the Creditors' Committee notifies the Debtors that the Committee intends to obtain from the Court authority to file a complaint, under the Code or other applicable law, against that Covered Employee; provided, however, that the escrowed payments shall be released if the Committee does not obtain such authority with 45 days of notice to the Debtors or does not file its complaint within 10 days after obtaining such authority;

c. the Covered Employee is indicted or agrees to the filing of a criminal information against him or her;

d. the Covered Employee is notified, or the Debtors are notified, that the Covered Employee is a target of a criminal investigation;

e. the Covered Employee is sued or is informed, or the Debtors are informed, that he or she will, in the near future, be sued by the United States Securities and Exchange Commission (the "SEC");

f. the Covered Employee is given notice by the SEC of his or her right to make a Wells submission; or

g. the Covered Employee declines, on grounds of the Fifth Amendment rights against self-incrimination, to answer questions with respect to conduct or transactions relating to his or her employment or affiliations with the Debtors. (Weber Supp'l Decl. ¶ 4, Ex. 1.)⁹

39. A Covered Employee must forfeit any escrowed incentive payment, or repay any incentive award(s) already paid, if it ultimately is determined, with respect to the subject conduct or transactions, that the Covered Employee failed to act in good faith and in a manner the

⁹ The Debtors have no present information or belief that such events are reasonably likely to occur. (Weber Supp'l Decl. Ex. 1.)

Company reasonably believes to be in or not opposed to the best interests of the Debtors.

Moreover, the Debtors may offset any clawback claim against a Covered Employee, without further order of the Bankruptcy Court, against any claim of any kind that the Covered Employee may have against the Debtors, including but not limited to any claim for indemnification.

(Weber Supp'l Decl. ¶ 4, Ex. 1.)

40. Any determination under the immediately preceding paragraph shall be made by the Board of Directors of Delphi Corporation, after notice to the Creditors' Committee and the participant and an opportunity to be heard by the participant, pursuant to the procedures set forth in the Debtors' bylaws, subject to the Creditors' Committee right to object to (based on the Creditors' Committee's review of the record) and, upon such objection, this Court's de novo review of the Debtors' determination with respect to any particular individual. This determination will be made in no event any later than the effective date of the Debtors' plan of reorganization, unless, for good cause shown with respect to a particular executive, the Court extends the period. (Weber Supp'l Decl. ¶ 4, Ex. 1.)

41. Finally, no one has suggested—and the Debtors are unaware of any legitimate basis to conclude—that any provision of the KECP is intended or will otherwise operate to limit the Debtors' right under any applicable federal, state, or common law, statute, rule, or regulation, or any corporate bylaw, policy, custom, or contractual provision, to seek disgorgement or restitution of, or to utilize any other available legal or equitable remedy to recover payments made, or withhold payments pending, if it becomes apparent that a Covered Employee improperly misrepresented the basis for his or her entitlement to a Revised Annual Incentive Plan performance award or was involved in misconduct. (Opie Decl. ¶ 27.)

ARGUMENT

II.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REVISED ANNUAL INCENTIVE PLAN
IS A TRANSACTION IN THE ORDINARY COURSE THAT
DOES NOT REQUIRE APPROVAL

A. The Code Authorizes Debtors-in-Possession to Implement Executive Compensation Programs in the Ordinary Course of their Business, without Notice or a Hearing

42. Following the filing of a petition for relief under chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code (the "Code"), the debtor is authorized to remain in possession of its assets and to continue operating its business. 11 U.S.C. §§ 1107-1108.

43. Section 363 governs the debtor-in-possession's use of estate assets. "The framework of section 363 [of the Code] is designed to allow a . . . debtor-in-possession . . . the flexibility to engage in ordinary transactions without unnecessary creditor and bankruptcy court oversight, while protecting creditors by giving them an opportunity to be heard when transactions are not ordinary." In re Roth Am., Inc., 975 F.2d 949, 952 (3d Cir. 1992).

44. Within this framework, section 363(c) of the Code provides that, unless otherwise ordered by the Court, a debtor-in-possession may "enter into transactions . . . in the ordinary course of business, without notice or a hearing, and may use property of the estate in the ordinary course of business without notice or a hearing." 11 U.S.C. § 363(c); see also id. §§ 1107, 1203, 1304(b).

45. The Code "recognizes the commercial facts of life." Bagus v. Clark, 5 F.3d 455, 457 (10th Cir. 1993). "[I]f a debtor had to seek court approval to pay for every expense incurred during the normal course of its affairs, the debtor would be in court more than in business." Id. at 457-58. Accordingly, "the Code likens the management of ordinary course operating affairs of a debtor to those of any business entity and allows the debtor's management free rein to make those decisions." Id. at 458.

46. The Code also "favors the continued operation of a business by a debtor, and a presumption of reasonableness attaches to a debtor's management decisions." In re Johns-Manville Corp., 60 B.R. 612, 615-16 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1986). This presumption arises from the courts' recognition that "the debtor and current management are best suited to orchestrate the debtor's rehabilitation." Id. at 616 (citing In re La Sherene, Inc., 3 B.R. 169, 174 (Bankr. N.D. Ga. 1980)).

47. Where the debtor continues the prepetition terms and conditions of executive employment beyond its entry into chapter 11, this presumption of reasonableness also "extends to include the compensation of management insiders." In re All Seasons Indus., Inc., 121 B.R. 822, 825-26 (N.D. Ind. 1990).

48. While objectors may attempt to rebut this presumption, it is their burden "to produce evidence, beyond the fact of bankruptcy or financial troubles, which would tend to indicate that the compensation being received by management is not reasonable or is somehow improper." Id. at 826.

49. When a question arises as to whether a particular transaction or use of estate property is an ordinary-course transaction, courts have developed and "routinely" employ a two-part test to analyze the disputed transaction or usage. Roth Am., 975 F.2d at 952; see also Lavigne v. Hirsch (In re Lavigne), 114 F.3d 379, 384-85 (2d Cir. 1997) (same).

50. The first element of this two-part analysis, commonly referred to as the "vertical test," focuses on the debtor's prepetition business practices, in order to discern any significant postpetition differences in treatment or usage. As long as the debtor's postpetition practices are consistent with the interested parties' reasonable prepetition expectations, "creditors have no right to notice and a hearing because their objections to such transactions are likely to relate to

the bankrupt's Chapter 11 status, not the particular transactions themselves." Johns-Manville, 60 B.R. at 616 (quoting In re James A. Phillips, Inc., 29 B.R. 391, 394 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1983)).

51. The second element of the two-part "ordinary course" analysis, called the "horizontal test," evaluates the subject transaction from an industry-wide perspective, to determine how like businesses treat the transactions or uses in the course of their day-to-day affairs. See, e.g., Lavigne, 114 F.3d at 385; Johns-Manville, 60 B.R. at 618. Where "a substantial number" of the debtor's peers "routinely" engage in the subject practice, the transaction or usage "meets the requirements of the horizontal dimension." Id. at 619.

52. At bottom, the "touchstone of 'ordinariness' is . . . the interested parties' reasonable expectations of what transactions the debtor in possession is likely to enter in the course of its business." Lavigne, 114 F.3d at 384-85. "Where the debtor in possession is merely exercising the privileges of its chapter 11 status, which include the right to operate the bankrupt business, there is no general right to notice and hearing concerning particular transactions." Phillips, 29 B.R. at 394.

B. The Debtors' Implementation of the Revised AIP is an "Ordinary Course" Transaction

53. At least since the Debtors' spin-off from GM as an independent entity, the Company has incorporated an annual incentive compensation plan as an integrated element of its total executive compensation program. The prepetition annual incentive plan, adopted in the ordinary course of Delphi's prepetition business, was designed to motivate covered employees to achieve the Debtors' corporate goals by providing potential rewards set in reference to a variety of business metrics, all of which ultimately were tied to increases in net earnings. (Weber Decl. ¶¶ 16, 20; Opie Decl. ¶ 5(b); Bubnovich Decl. ¶¶ 12(b), 22, 25, 28.)

54. The Revised Annual Incentive Plan merely represents, in all material respects, an extension of the Debtors' prepetition annual incentive plan, refined to accommodate the

exigencies and uncertainties of the chapter 11 process. Nevertheless, it remains structured to motivate Covered Employees to achieve the Debtors' overall business plan, by maintaining the link between payment opportunities and the Debtors' achievement of its corporate financial targets. (Bubnovich Decl. ¶¶ 19, 29, 37; see also Opie Decl. ¶¶ 18, 20-21.)

55. Following the Petition Date, and in consultation with the Creditors' Committee, the Debtors have tuned the Revised Annual Incentive Plan's financial metrics to ensure that executive performance remains sensitive to the evolving demands of these chapter 11 cases. For example, the abbreviated performance measurement cycles represent a recognition of the difficulties currently facing the Debtors in making accurate long-term financial forecasts, yet also sharpen the Debtors' ability to set earnings targets that are neither unattainably high nor so low that eligibility becomes automatic. Similarly, while the particular financial metrics used during the pre-confirmation period have been modified, when compared to their prepetition counterparts, all Revised AIP payment opportunities nevertheless remain linked to increases in the Debtor's core earnings. Payment opportunities likewise remain subject to individual adjustment, based on each employee's specific achievements for that year. (Weber Decl. ¶ 16; Weber Supp'l Decl. ¶ 9, Ex. 2; Opie Decl. ¶¶ 5(b), 19-20, 22, 24; Bubnovich Decl. ¶¶ 12(b), 19, 34, 36.)

56. Based on the Debtors' longstanding executive compensation programs and practices, therefore, the Revised Annual Incentive Plan does not subject any Objector to post-petition economic risks of a nature different from those faced by the Objectors at any time during the prepetition period.

57. Some Objectors' incorrectly suggestions that the Debtors are now proposing to take money from their hourly employees (or, similarly, to take money that otherwise would be

used to pay down the Debtors' outstanding pension benefit obligations) to pay their executives bonuses. However, Covered Employees will only become eligible to receive their performance awards if the Debtors perform in a manner consistent with the overall interests of the Debtors' estate. The EBITDAR-UG/OIBITDAR-UG metric that the Debtors intend to use in connection with calculating payment opportunities under the Revised AIP has been refined to make clear the Debtors' intention to exclude earnings gains, if any, related to contract modifications between the Debtors and the Unions. (Weber Decl. ¶ 18; Opie Decl. ¶¶ 13-14, 21-22; Bubnovich Decl. ¶¶ 29, 32.)

58. Nor does the Revised Annual Incentive Plan represent an approach to executive compensation that is unique to the Debtors. To the contrary, the Debtors have introduced uncontested evidence that in the ordinary course of their businesses, virtually all Fortune 1000 companies (Delphi is a Fortune 100 company), and all publicly-held corporations in the auto supply industry, incorporate annual or other short-term incentive plans into the compensation packages they offer their executive workforces. The sound business reason for this universal practice is the recognition that short-term, achievement-based incentive compensation linked to specific performance targets and acceptable levels of personal performance do motivate employees to realize the entity's projected business plan during any particular performance cycle. (Bubnovich Decl. ¶¶ 23-24, 44; see also Opie Decl. ¶¶ 4, 5(b).)

59. Furthermore, the principal financial performance metric utilized by the Debtors in these chapter 11 cases—EBITDAR, as refined during the course of discussions between the Debtors and the Creditors' Committee—not only is the metric used most often by chapter 11 debtors, it also is used by non-bankrupt companies engaged in out-of-court restructurings, or that otherwise find themselves in periods of financial distress. The two specific earnings exclusions

introduced since the Petition Date, and at the request of the Creditors' Committee, merely refine the Debtors' Petition-Date, widely-recognized, and commonplace obligation to exclude from their pre-emergence earnings calculations the potential effect of non-recurring or non-operational events that might otherwise affect the Debtors' ability to achieve their financial targets.

(Bubnovich Decl. ¶¶ 29, 31; Opie Decl. ¶¶ 21-23.)

60. In sum, the Revised Annual Incentive Plan now before the Court does not offend any interested party's reasonable prepetition expectations about what transactions the Debtors likely would enter in the ordinary course of conducting their business. Quite the opposite: the proposed plan is well within the range of competitive practice, and it is consistent not only with the ordinary course of the Debtors' prepetition business practices, but also with those adopted in the ordinary course by the Debtors' peers. (Bubnovich Decl. ¶ 44.) And because the Debtors merely are exercising the privileges of their chapter 11 status by implementing the Revised Annual Incentive Plan in the ordinary course of conducting their postpetition business, the Debtors need not provide notice and a hearing in order to implement these provisions.

III.

THE REVISED ANNUAL INCENTIVE PLAN ALSO QUALIFIES AS AN INFORMED BUSINESS JUDGMENT DESERVING THE COURT'S APPROVAL

A. Section 363(b)(1) Authorizes Courts to Approve a Debtor's Implementation of an Executive Compensation Program that Falls Outside the Ordinary Course of its Business

61. Notwithstanding the broad authority the Code grants a debtor-in-possession to operate its business without unnecessary oversight of creditors or the courts, section 363(b) of the Code also permits the debtor-in-possession, after notice and a hearing, to "use, sell, or lease, other than in the ordinary course of business, property of the estate." 11 U.S.C. § 363(b)(1).

62. Courts may authorize a debtor to use estate property pursuant to section 363(b)(1) whenever the debtor, in good faith, has provided a "good business reason" that the proposed

usage will ultimately "aid in the reorganization." In re Lionel Corp., 722 F.2d 1063, 1071 (2d Cir. 1983). The Code provides the court "considerable discretion" in addressing such a section 363(b) motion, and the Court's factual findings will stand unless clearly erroneous. In re Montgomery Ward Holding Corp., 242 B.R. 147, 152-53 (Bankr. D. Del. 1999).

63. The Second Circuit has held that, while the Bankruptcy Court sits as an "overseer of the wisdom with which the bankruptcy estate's property is being managed by the . . . debtor-in-possession," it must nevertheless resist becoming "arbiter of disputes between creditors and the estate." Orion Pictures Corp., 4 F.3d at 1098-99 .

64. The Court's consideration of a debtor's section 363(b) motion is a summary proceeding, intended merely as a means to "efficiently review the . . . debtor's decision[s] . . . in the course of the swift administration of the bankruptcy estate. It is not the time or place for prolonged discovery or a lengthy trial with disputed issues." Orion Pictures, 4 F.3d at 1098-99.

65. The debtor has the burden of establishing a valid business purpose for the use of estate property outside the ordinary course of business. Lionel, 722 F.2d at 1070-71. Once the debtor has done so, a presumption arises that the debtor's decision was made on an informed basis, in good faith, and in an honest belief that the action was in the best interests of the estate. In re Integrated Res., Inc., 147 B.R. 650, 656 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1992).

66. Thereafter, "[p]arties opposing the proposed exercise of a debtor's business judgment have the burden of rebutting the presumption of validity." Id.

67. To satisfy its burden, it is not enough for an objector simply to raise and argue an objection. Rather, an objector "is required to produce some evidence respecting its objections." Lionel, 722 F.2d at 1071.

68. As a rule, the debtor's business judgment "should be approved by the court unless it is shown to be 'so manifestly unreasonable that it could not be based upon sound business judgment, but only on bad faith, or whim or caprice.'" In re Aerovox, Inc., 269 B.R. 74, 81 (Bankr. D. Del. 2001) (quoting In re Interco, Inc., 128 B.R. 229, 234 (Bankr. E.D. Mo. 1991)).

69. Whenever a debtor seeks the court's authorization under section 363(b) to use estate property to fund a key employee compensation program, the pertinent questions are whether "the debtor has used proper business judgment in formulating the program" and whether the program is "fair and reasonable." Aerovox, 269 B.R. at 80 (quoting In re Logical Software, 66 B.R. 683, 696 (Bankr. D. Mass. 1986)).

70. The determination of whether to approve a key employee compensation plan under section 363(b)(1) "turns on the facts and circumstances of each case." Montgomery Ward, 242 B.R. at 154.

71. Although the debtor's consideration of what other companies have done in comparable circumstances is relevant to whether the debtor exercised an informed business judgment, the debtor need not demonstrate that its proposed program provides "exact parity with other companies" to obtain the Court's approval. In re Pac. Gas & Elec. Co., No. 01-30923 (SFM), 2001 WL 34133840, at *2 (Bankr. N.D. Cal. July 13, 2001).

72. With regard to an examination of the particulars of a proposed key employee compensation program, the Court should not "view its role as second guessing" the debtor's judgment on questions such as which employees should be eligible for the program or how much any particular employee should receive. Id. Nor should the Court delve into the likelihood that any individual employee may leave unless he or she is promised what the debtor proposes. Id.

B. The Proposed Revised AIP Reflects a Sound Exercise of Business Judgment

73. The Debtors respectfully submit that the Revised Annual Incentive Plan they propose and now seek to implement reflects a sound exercise of business judgment reasonably calculated to maximize the value of the Debtors' estates.

74. In recognition of the significant challenges facing the Debtors in connection with their union negotiations, the Debtors critically re-examined all of elements of their total prepetition executive compensation plans, with an eye towards retaining only those components the Debtors reasonably believed would be necessary on a post-petition basis. As a result, the Debtors elected to cancel all non-vested PAP awards (i.e., those for the 2004-06 and 2005-07 business performance cycles). Going forward, therefore, the Debtors intend to rely on the Revised AIP, a more conservative, market-based compensation approach, in order to realize the Debtors' short-term business goals. (Weber Decl. ¶¶ 14, 16; see also Opie Decl. ¶¶ 9, 13-14.)

75. The Debtors' formulation of the Revised AIP not only resulted from its own experience and the contributions of its Advisors, including Watson Wyatt, a leader in the field of executive compensation, but also from the process of negotiation with the Creditors' Committee and its compensation advisor, Pearl Meyer of Steven Hall & Partners. What emerged from this process is a Revised AIP that the Creditors' Committee unqualifiedly endorses in its form and substance and that is, in terms of which executives may earn how much and under what conditions, fair and reasonable.

76. Moreover, the Debtors' decision to implement the Revised AIP now— notwithstanding the protests of their unions and the belated misgivings of the Creditors' Committee—resulted from a balanced consideration by senior management, the Compensation Committee, the independent directors, and ultimately the full Board of Directors of all the pertinent facts and considerations.

77. For their parts, the Objectors have not provided any relevant evidence—much less persuasive evidence—to sustain their burden of proving that the Revised AIP is not fair and reasonable, in its form, substance, or timing. Accordingly, the Objections to the Motion should be overruled and the Revised AIP as modified, be granted.

IV.
THE GENERAL OBJECTIONS TO THE REVISED AIP LACK MERIT

A. The Objection to any Form of KECP at this Time

78. Several objecting unions have stated or implied that they consider any form of key employee incentive plan inappropriate, regardless of its scope, proposed terms, or components. They argue that any program of incentive compensation for Delphi executives would be unfair and inequitable, in light of the Debtors' request for wage and benefits reductions from its hourly employees. These unions would thus deny to the Debtors—a Fortune 100 company—the ability to offer their executive a form of compensation not only common to their competitors, but also to American business, in general.

79. However, at this critical juncture, the Debtors must ensure that they remain efficient and market-competitive in every aspect of their business. If Delphi is to be successfully reorganized, its costs—including all segments of its human capital costs—must be made competitive with those of its U.S. peers. Moreover, if Delphi is to prosper in the future, it must offer competitive employment propositions to its executive workforce, particularly for those with critical management-level responsibilities. For the Objectors to argue that all parties must "sacrifice equally"—measured solely by changes made after the Petition Date—overlooks the fact the future of the Company depends not only upon motivating existing employees, but also upon attracting and motivating new executive talent. (Weber Decl. ¶¶ 8-12, 31-37; Bubnovich Decl. ¶¶ 8-11, 23-24, 40-43; see also Opie Decl. ¶¶ 6-8, 10-11, 14, 18.)

80. Other Objectors, including the Creditors' Committee, suggest that the KECP Motion is ill-timed and that consideration of the Revised Annual Incentive Plan should await negotiation or litigation of whatever motions the Debtors might file under sections 1113 and 1114 of the Code. The Debtors suspect that, for some of these Objectors, no time is the right time for a KECP. The Debtors filed the KECP Motion with their other First Day Motions—and before the completion of section 1113 negotiations and litigation—because of the importance of their executive workforce to the Debtors' survival and successful reorganization. Moreover, by filing the Motion early, the Debtors have provided interested parties disclosure of and an opportunity to comment on the financial incentives they hope to offer the Company's key executives. In all events, the Motion has been filed, and the purported effect, if any, of the Revised Annual Incentive Plan on hourly-employee morale would be no different were the Motion deferred until after a resolution of the section 1113 negotiations. (Opie Decl. ¶¶ 12, 28.)

81. While the Debtors did not, of course, consult with other parties-in-interest before they filed the KECP Motion, they certainly have provided the Objectors specific information about how the program was developed and an opportunity to comment on it. And the Revised Annual Incentive Plan has in fact evolved, partly as a result of some of their questions and concerns. Here, parties-in-interest were never denied critical information or an opportunity to comment. To the contrary, the Debtors made affirmative efforts, after the Motion was filed but before the hearing, not only to elicit the specifics underlying the Objectors' concerns and the bases for their concerns, but also to address those concerns to the extent reasonably appropriate. The fact remains, however, that for some Objectors, no executive incentive plan in any form would ever be acceptable. For them, no concession, proposal, change, or additional consultation—in short, nothing short of abandoning incentive compensation for executives at

Delphi altogether—would have made a difference. (Weber Decl. ¶¶ 17-19; Weber Supp'l Decl. ¶¶ 2-10, Exs. 1-2; see also Opie Decl. ¶¶ 12, 16-17, 21-25.)

82. In a similar vein, other Objectors argue that given the significant pay and benefit reductions the Debtors are seeking from their hourly workforce in connection with these proceedings, approval of the Revised AIP (or any other key employee incentive program) would destroy any possibility of obtaining meaningful union reductions in connection with the forthcoming section 1113 negotiations, would lead to a strike, and would thereby doom any hope for a successful reorganization. These arguments rest upon speculation and lack the support of any competent proof. Moreover, these Objectors fail to recognize that the need for wage and benefit concessions by the Debtors' hourly workforce, in the face of steadily declining marketplace conditions, is an issue separate from the need to attract and motivate key management personnel, who have seen their employment and compensation prospects slip, in comparative terms, over the last five years. In the end, these Objectors, in effect, seek to make executive compensation a component of the negotiations required by section 1113(b), thereby granting the unions additional bargaining leverage that neither their collective bargaining agreements nor the law grants them.

83. Ultimately, the objections to the proposed timing of the Revised AIP rest upon a difference of opinion about what is best for the Debtors' estates. The Objectors, and particularly the unions, say that now is simply not the right time for a Revised AIP—a view that also happens to coincide with their own interests. The Debtors' Board of Directors, however, is charged with broader fiduciary duties, and it has carefully considered the matter and made a different judgment. It met as recently as February 1, 2005, and the independent directors separately and independently determined, in the exercise of their business judgment, and after considering all

the facts and circumstances of the case—including the views of various constituencies, as well as the effects of continuing uncertainty on the Debtors' executive corps, and on ongoing negotiations with the unions and GM—that the Debtors should proceed with the Revised AIP now. (Opie Decl. ¶ 28.) The Debtors submit that, on this record, there is simply no basis for overturning that judgment.

B. The Objection that no KECP is Needed

84. Several Objectors suggest that no KECP is needed to motivate the Debtors to perform in a manner that best serves the Debtors' reorganization goals or to attract new talent.

85. As an overarching principle, the Revised AIP is not incremental to the Debtors' basic executive compensation structure; rather, it is an integral and non-severable element of it. The record, moreover, confirms that the Debtors have a reasonable basis to conclude that the Revised Annual Incentive Plan is necessary to aid in the Debtors' reorganization. The executive attrition rate at the Company increased significantly during the prepetition period and has accelerated since the Petition Date, on October 8, 2005. During the twelve-month period between October 8, 2003, and October 7, 2004, only 13 executives quit. In the twelve-month period preceding the Petition Date, however, 21 executives quit, an increase of almost 62%. Since October 8, 2005, sixteen more executives (including two more this week)—with almost 260 years of service to the Debtors—have either quit or given the Debtors notice that they will do so in the near future. If executive departures continue at this rate, the Debtors can expect to lose more than 45 executives during their first year in chapter 11. Furthermore, in the first five weeks of 2006, the Debtors have averaged two quits per week. These attrition statistics do not include retirements or separations initiated by the Debtors. As one court cogently observed in authorizing a KECP over an objection that the debtor had not provided evidence that executive attrition was widespread, "it is no good shutting the barn door after the horses have left." Pac.

Gas & Elec. Co., 2001 WL 34133840, at *2 n.6. (Weber Decl. ¶¶ 24 & n.5, 33-35; Bubnovich Decl. ¶¶ 41-42; Opie Decl. ¶ 8.)

86. Whenever an executive or manager departs from an industrial enterprise, the employer loses all of that employee's experience and knowledge, and often on relatively short notice. Executive attrition also disrupts the orderly operations of the business, as other personnel are forced to add the responsibilities of the departed employees to their own. Replacing departed executives also requires the employer to incur costs that could otherwise be avoided, such as signing bonuses, reimbursement of relocation expenses, and executive search fees. When the employer is undergoing court-supervised reorganization, the chapter 11 process imposes additional obligations and stress on all employees. Those Objectors who argue that the Debtors would be better off if they lost existing executives apparently have given no thought to how their approach not only would overburden and demoralize all of the Debtors' employees who remain, but also saddle the Debtors with the replacement costs associated with executive attrition. (Weber Decl. ¶¶ 33, 35; Bubnovich Decl. ¶¶ 42-43; Opie Decl. ¶ 8.)

C. The Objection that the KECP Rewards Management Incompetence or Fraud

87. Some Objectors claim that the KECP Motion should be denied because the Revised Annual Incentive Plan would "reward" the very people whose managerial ineptitude put the Company into bankruptcy or who committed fraud.

88. These allegations fail at the outset. Notwithstanding specific discovery requests propounded by the Debtors to ascertain the basis for these allegations, these Objectors have provided no evidence whatsoever to support their contention that the Debtors were "mismanaged" or "defrauded" into bankruptcy, a matter on which they have the burden of proof.

89. To the contrary: no evidence exists because the allegations have no basis. The Debtors' petitions—like those of other industry participants—resulted from the financial crisis

facing the entire domestic automobile industry. Delphi, in particular, also faced the unique burden of legacy labor agreements that rendered its hourly labor costs uncompetitive. These industry- and company-specific conditions, if anything, underscore the importance of providing competitive compensation opportunities if the Debtors are to attract and motivate the management talent needed to surmount the difficult challenges ahead. The Objectors also forget that, because Revised Annual Incentive Plan payments turn on future performance, they are not at all a "reward" to be granted, or withheld, on the basis of past actions. (Weber. Decl. ¶¶ 8-10, 12, 18-26; Bubnovich Decl. ¶¶ 28-38; Opie Decl. ¶¶ 18-24; infra at ¶¶ 105-06.)

90. With respect to the similar suggestion that the Revised AIP "rewards" those who have engaged in securities fraud, the Objectors again have provided no supporting evidence, notwithstanding specific discovery requests to ascertain the basis, if any, for these allegations. Indeed, the documents produced in response to the Debtors' requests do not bring these Objectors within haling distance of support, either for these objections, or the representation, made in open Court, that the Objectors' document production "shows" a Company-wide conspiracy, willful ignorance of improper accounting methods, or that "fifteen specific people" identified in the Objections to the KECP "had either participated in the fraud, knew of it, tolerated it, et cetera." (Tr. Pr. Jan. 5, 2006, at 173:17-173:19.) To suggest that these or any other documents produced in response to the Debtors' Requests somehow "show" that "there was a pervasive culture of manipulating the books" is fanciful, to say the least. (Id. at 176:15-176:16.)

91. The original KECP Motion did not expressly address the effect on a Covered Employee's eligibility for annual incentive payments if the Debtors were later to determine that he or she had been involved in misconduct. Based on the Audit Committee's internal investigation of matters related to the Debtors' June 30, 2005, restatement of certain prior period

financial statements, however, as well as the employment actions undertaken by the Debtors in connection therewith, the Compensation Committee proceeded under the presumption that any individual who remained employed as a Delphi executive would be eligible to participate in the KECP. (Opie Decl. ¶ 25; see also Bubnovich Decl. ¶ 18.)

92. To provide additional protection to property of the Debtors' estates, the Debtors and the Creditors Committee negotiated, and the Debtors have agreed to adopt, rigorous safe harbor and prophylactic measures. Compare Weber Supp'l Decl. ¶ 4, Ex. 1, with In re Enron Corp., No. 01-16034 (AJG), 2002 WL 32150521, at *2 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. May 8, 2002) (providing for disgorgement and plan exclusion but not for escrow of payments), and In re Enron Corp., No. 01-16034 (AJG), 2003 WL 22038716, at *1 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. Feb. 6, 2003) (providing for suspension and escrow of plan payments pending a final determination of whether the employee engaged in improper conduct). (Weber Decl. ¶¶ 27-30; Opie Decl. ¶ 26; see also supra ¶¶ 38-40.)

D. The Objection that the KECP Violates Section 331 of BAPCA

93. Some Objectors contend that the KECP should be rejected because it contravenes the terms or the spirit of section 331 of the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 ("BAPCA"), Pub. L. 109-8 (2005), which amended section 503(c) of the Code ("Amended Section 503(c)").

94. At the outset, it should be apparent that Amended Section 503(c) does not apply to this case because it became effective on October 17, 2005, after this case was filed. See BAPCA § 1501. Nor have the Objectors presented argument or evidence that Congress intended the courts to apply BAPCA on a retroactive basis.

95. Even if Amended Section 503(c) applied retroactively, the Revised AIP passes muster. Amended Section 503(c) prohibits allowance or transfers to insiders of the debtor "for

the purpose of inducing such person to remain with the debtor's business," absent specific findings by the court that certain provisions are satisfied. (Emphasis added.)¹⁰

96. Although Amended Section 503(c) has yet to be construed, the courts' analysis of analogous language suggest that: (a) this restriction requires proof that in making the transfer, the Debtor had a conscious purpose to induce the insider to remain with the debtor's business; and (b) while such purpose need not have been the debtor's sole purpose, it must have been more than merely incidental; it must have been one of the debtor's "dominant" purposes—in the sense that these motivations predominate over other, less powerful motivations for the conduct. Cf. Mortensen v. United States, 322 U.S. 369, 373-74 (1944) (construing section 2 of the Mann Act); United States v. Miller, 148 F.3d 207, 211 (2d Cir. 1998) (affirming jury instruction in prosecution for violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2423(a)). This interpretation is appropriate because, to some degree, all compensation, including salaries, incentive compensation, and bonuses of most kinds, can be said to induce employee "retention." After all, one typically does not get paid a salary unless he or she shows up for work, or receive a bonus if he quits before they are paid.

97. Finally, the suggestion that the Revised Annual Incentive Plan should be rejected because it is prohibited by the amended Code is based on a mischaracterization of the Revised Annual Incentive Plan itself. It is apparent on the face of the KECP that the Revised Annual Incentive Plan does not does not include a retention or "pay to stay" component, i.e., a provision that pays the employee simply for agreeing to stay with the debtor, irrespective of how long the

¹⁰ In relevant part, Amended Section 503(c) effectively prohibits "a transfer made to, or an obligation incurred for the benefit of, an insider of the debtor for the purpose of inducing such person to remain with the debtor's business, absent a finding by the court based on evidence in the record that — (A) the transfer or obligation is essential to retention of the person because the individual has a bona fide job offer from another business at the same or greater rate of compensation; [and] (B) the services provided by the person are essential to the survival of the business." 11 U.S.C. § 503(c) (2005).

debtor remains in chapter 11 or how it performs in the reorganization process. To the contrary: the Revised AIP is intended to replace the prepetition AIP, under which covered executives were eligible for performance awards based on the Company's achievement of net earnings targets at year end. Such plans simply are not "retention plans" of the sort that prompted Congress to enact Amended Section 503(c). (Weber Decl. ¶¶ 14, 16; Bubnovich Decl. ¶¶ 7, 17, 28.) Moreover, assuming, for the sake of argument, that BAPCPA were applicable, the vast majority of the 466 Covered Employees are not "insiders" of the Debtors, as defined in the Code, thus rendering Amended Section 503(c) inapplicable as to them.

98. Similarly, because Revised AIP payments are expressly linked to "specific performance . . . targets" and "acceptable level[s] of personal performance" (KECP Mtn. ¶¶ 25, 27), it emphatically is not the case that the Revised AIP fails to tie proposed increases to executive job performance. Nor is it true that Covered Employees are guaranteed a bonus regardless of what, if anything, they do to assure the Debtors' successful emergence from chapter 11. (Weber Decl. ¶¶ 22-26; Bubnovich Decl. ¶¶ 19, 29-34, 36-37.)

99. Accordingly, the evidence leaves no doubt that "the purpose" of the Revised Annual Incentive Plan is not to induce the Company's key executives to remain with the Debtors' businesses, but to motivate them to achieve the Debtors' business objectives during the reorganization, and to maximize returns to the Debtors' stakeholders following the reorganized entity's emergence from these chapter 11 proceedings.

V.

THE SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS TO THE REVISED AIP ARE MOOT AND MISTAKEN

100. In their particularized objections to the Revised Annual Incentive Plan, some Objectors assert that EBITDAR is not an appropriate measure of financial performance. Others have observed that, since the EBITDAR targets had not yet been announced, their

reasonableness could not be evaluated, that no rewards should be paid if the Company falls short of its targets, and that compensation should not be "increased" without consideration of the value created for the benefit of the estate's creditors.

101. As to the first contention, that the Revised Annual Incentive Plan should not be authorized because the EBITDAR targets have not yet been set by the Compensation Committee, and thus the reasonableness of the Debtors' financial targets cannot be determined, this objection, of course, is now moot. The Compensation Committee, in consultation with its Advisors (with additional input from the Creditors' Committee and its advisors), disclosed the Debtors' enterprise- and division-level financial targets on February 1, 2006. These targets now are a part of the total mix of information now before the Court. (Weber Decl. ¶¶ 18, 22, Ex. C; Bubnovich Decl. ¶¶ 29-30, 32, Ex. A; see also Weber Supp'l Decl. ¶¶ 5-10, Ex. 2.)

102. Other Objectors have suggested that the use of EBITDAR targets permits the Debtors to claim earnings gains—and thus to make payments to Covered Employees—not properly attributable to the efforts of the Debtors' executive workforce to "grow the Company's business." Thus, argue these Objectors, if the Debtors are successful in rejecting collective bargaining agreements, or if the Debtors can secure contract concessions from GM, the earnings increases resulting from these reductions in expenses will permit Covered Employees to receive "bonuses" they have done nothing to earn.

103. To the extent that a fair reading of the original KECP Motion reasonably permitted such an inference, this objection, too, now is moot. The evidence before the Court in connection with the February 10, 2006, hearing is clear that the Compensation Committee, in consultation with its Advisors (and with additional input from the Creditors' Committee and its advisors), has disclaimed any intent to include in their pre-emergence award calculations any

gains obtained as a result of the Debtors' ongoing negotiations with GM or the Unions. At the enterprise level, therefore, the Debtors will use "EBITDAR-UG," i.e., "earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation, amortization, restructuring costs, but excluding earnings, if any, resulting from contractual negotiations with GM and the Unions," to calculate Revised Annual Incentive Plan opportunities. Although the Debtors will substitute "operating income" for "earnings" for division-level executive incentive payments, the principle is the same: achievement of targets and payments will be calculated using "OIBITDAR-UG," i.e., "operating income before interest, taxes, depreciation, amortization, restructuring costs, but excluding earnings, if any, resulting from contractual negotiations with GM and the Unions." (Weber Decl. ¶¶ 18, 22; Bubnovich Decl. ¶¶ 32-33, Ex. A; see also Weber Supp'l Decl. ¶¶ 5-10, Ex. 2.)

104. Some Objectors have suggested that the use of EBITDAR-based performance measures reduces the incentive to restrain restructuring charges or discourages the use of post-petition credit in a responsible, fiscally prudent fashion. There are significant business reasons, however, for the Debtors' executive workforce to work to control interest and restructuring costs, irrespective of the Revised Annual Incentive Plan. Any increase in the Debtors' interest or restructuring costs will be to the detriment of the Debtors' available liquidity, the most critical metric for chapter 11 debtors. The Debtors, as fiduciaries of the estates, cannot risk the fiscal health of the enterprise (and thus the Debtors' estates) by unreasonably increasing interest costs. It also should be noted that interests costs are controlled by only a handful of the Debtors' executive workforce with responsibility for corporate finance. It simply is not appropriate to

include these finance-related costs in a metric designed to measure the Debtors' core operating performance.¹¹

105. Some union Objectors have suggested that the Debtors' executive compensation levels have not kept pace with industry standards because of a failure of effort or imagination on the part of management in attempting to achieve the Debtors' financial targets and business goals. These Objectors correctly recognize the link between declining executive salary levels and the Debtors' inability to achieve its various financial goals. The conclusion they apparently draw from this link, however—that if management simply tried harder, things would work out—is unsupported by any evidence whatsoever.

106. Furthermore, as part of its separation agreements with GM, Delphi was required to assume the terms and conditions of the collective bargaining agreements that GM had negotiated with its unions. The majority of the Debtors' legacy collective bargaining agreements thus provide not only for wages and benefits that are well above market, but they also require Delphi to provide non-competitive pension plans, retiree health care, and other benefits, and impose a variety of significant additional operating restrictions on Delphi. The result is that Delphi is substantially disadvantaged in its ability to compete in the automotive parts business on the basis of cost, thereby hobbling the Debtors' ability to achieve its overall business plan, and limiting the Company's ability to offer an executive employment proposition that remains competitive with other Fortune 100 companies and the Debtors' industry peers. (Weber Decl. ¶¶ 8-10.)

¹¹ It is one of the functions of the equity component of the Emergence Incentive Compensation Plan—which is available only upon the Debtors' successful emergence from chapter 11, and which currently is not before the Court—to encourage the prudent pre-emergence use of the estate assets, and thereby preserve and enhance the post-emergence value of the estate.

107. Finally, the suggestion by one or two Objectors that the Revised AIP "increases" executive compensation without regard to delivering value for the benefit of the estates' creditors fails on two fronts. First, annual, performance-based incentive payments are not an "increase" in executive compensation; they are instead an essential component of the basic compensation package that have been offered to Delphi's executive since before the Company was spun-off from GM. Moreover, the notion that the Revised AIP will not deliver "value for the benefit of the estates' creditors" reveals a failure to recollect or appreciate the views and actions of the Creditors' Committee—the one creditor body charged by law with a fiduciary duty to protect and enhance the interests of all creditors. Less than a month ago, counsel for the Creditors' Committee made clear on the record what the Committee expected and would support by way of a short-term annual incentive program:

We are talking here about the debtors' business judgment in proposing a . . . plan for compensation based on performance. . . .

. . . .

It's a very, very limited program, which is somewhat consistent, as Mr. Butler said, with past programs, except frankly, far more aggressive. The committee won't approve that which has been on the table before. It will be far more aggressive in terms of being granularly performance based.

That, Your Honor, is well within the debtors' business discretion, it seems to me. And will or won't get the committee's support depending on the extent to which it [meets the standard] that I just laid out.

(Tr. Pr. Jan. 13, 2006, at 215:12-217:5.) In the end, the Committee's endorsement of the "form and substance" of the Revised AIP belies any suggestion that the program that the Debtors have proposed will not deliver value for the benefit of creditors.

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, the Debtors respectfully request that this Court enter an order, in substantially the form of that attached hereto as Exhibit B, overruling the objections, granting the motion, and granting the Debtors such other and further relief as is just.

Dated: New York, New York
February 8, 2006

SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER
& FLOM LLP

By: /s/ John Wm. Butler, Jr.
John Wm. Butler, Jr. (JB 4711)
David E. Springer (DS 9331)
John K. Lyons (JL 4951)
Ron E. Meisler (RM 3026)
333 West Wacker Drive, Suite 2100
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 407-0700

- and -

By: /s/ Kayalyn A. Marafioti
Kayalyn A. Marafioti (KM 9632)
Thomas J. Matz (TM 5986)
Four Times Square
New York, New York 10036
(212) 735-3000

Attorneys for Delphi Corporation, et al.,
Debtors and Debtors-in-Possessio

EXHIBIT A

Objection Summary Chart

Objections To Motion For Order Under §§ 105 And 363 Authorizing The Debtors To Implement A Key Employee Compensation Program

Tab	Objecting Party	Docket No.	Date of ECF Filing	Summary of Objection
1	Wilmington Trust Company	1133	11/22/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KECP does not represent sound exercise of business judgment. The purported 5% attrition rate of executives does not warrant a costly executive retention program. No evidence that the recent departure of executive caused any harm to the Debtors. • KECP would be prohibited under amended Bankruptcy Code. KECP is a retention program. • EBITDAR is an inappropriate measure of executive performance. For example, if CBAs are modified/rejected under 1113, EBITDAR will increase, but earnings are not attributed to performance of covered employees. • Use of EBITDAR eliminates incentive to control restructuring costs. Debtors also have control over their interest-related expenses. • EBITDAR targets have not yet been set by the Compensation Committee. • Emergence plan contains no performance-based criteria. Plan ignores sale price or return to shareholders. • It is premature to award 10% of equity to covered employees. Equity component provides disincentive for Debtors to sell assets. • Approval of KECP may harm labor negotiations.
2	United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers, International Union (USW), AFL-CIO	1134	11/22/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KECP fails to satisfy business judgment standard. • <u>Annual Incentive Plan</u> -- management did not keep pace with industry because management failed to meet incentive targets. Chapter 11 cases should not be the opportunity for management to catch up to industry peers. EBITDAR targets have not yet been set by the Compensation Committee.

Tab	Objecting Party	Docket No.	Date of ECF Filing	Summary of Objection
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Emergence Bonus Plan</u> -- KECP would be prohibited under amended Bankruptcy Code. KECP is a retention program. • It is premature to award 10% of equity to covered employees. Equity component provides disincentive for Debtors to sell assets. • <u>Severance Program</u> -- Severance plan would be prohibited under amended Bankruptcy Code. Executives being compensated are the ones responsible for the Company's failure. • Approval of KECP may harm labor negotiations.
3	International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America	1135	11/22/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of KECP may harm labor negotiations. • Use of EBITDAR eliminates incentive to control restructuring costs. • Court should take an independent review of KECP and apply a "fair and reasonable" standard and subject the KECP to "rigorous scrutiny." • KECP would be prohibited under amended Bankruptcy Code. KECP is a retention program. • KECP can only be reasonably evaluated at the end of a case. • EBITDAR targets have not yet been set by the Compensation Committee. • Use of EBITDAR eliminates incentive to control restructuring costs. • Recent departure of executives could be for numerous reasons and may not be an indication of future departures. • KECP is detrimental to employee morale. Approval of KECP may harm labor negotiations.
4	Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation	1141	11/22/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debtors have not presented sufficient evidence establishing that KECP is a sound business decision that will aid in the Debtors' financial recovery. • Unreasonable to propose generous compensation to executives while they face a \$400 million minimum funding contributions due to the pension plans in January 2006. • The purported 5% attrition rate of executives does not warrant a costly executive retention program.

Tab	Objecting Party	Docket No.	Date of ECF Filing	Summary of Objection
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KECP will hinder Debtors' ability to reorganize. It is premature to award 10% of equity to covered employees. • Approval of KECP is inequitable and may harm labor negotiations.
5	International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Union No. 663 and the International Association of Machinists, AFL-CIO Tool and Die Makers Local Lodge 78, District 10	1156	11/23/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KECP will hinder Debtors' ability to reorganize. Approval of KECP is inequitable and may harm labor negotiations. • Court should either deny motion or defer until end of chapter 11 cases. Provides no incentive for executives to seek emergence from chapter 11. • Debtors have not shown that the KECP is necessary or appropriate for their reorganization. • KECP would be prohibited under amended Bankruptcy Code. KECP is a retention program.
6	JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A., as administrative agent, for itself and a syndicate of approximately 250 senior secured lenders (Limited Objection of Prepetition Lenders)	1157	11/23/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The Prepetition Agent does not dispute the Debtors' need to motivate key employees for the duration of these Chapter 11 cases (and beyond) and agrees that appropriate incentive plans are essential tools in that effort." Prepetition Agent's objection is limited to parts of KECP that fail to create effective incentives to maximize value. • Compensation should not be increased without consideration of the value created by members of management for the benefit of creditors. Emergence Bonus Plan rewards attendance, not performance. • Cash component of Emergence Bonus Plan should be tied to value generated by Debtors' management. • It is premature to award 10% of equity to covered employees. Value cannot be determined at this time. Should be deferred until formation of Plan. • EBITDAR targets have not yet been set by the Compensation Committee. Prepetition Agent wants opportunity to review the Debtors' business plan and performance targets.

Tab	Objecting Party	Docket No.	Date of ECF Filing	Summary of Objection
7	International Union of Operating Engineers Local Union Nos. 18, 101, and 832	1159	11/23/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KECP is inappropriate at this time, prior to giving various stakeholder an opportunity to investigate the causes of the Debtors' financial losses to date. It would be inappropriate to provide incentives to the very management that caused the losses. • Approval of KECP is inequitable and may harm labor negotiations. • Debtors are not entitled to business judgment rule's presumption. Debtors cannot demonstrate due care, informed judgment, good faith or disinterestedness. • It is premature to award 10% of equity to covered employees. Value cannot be determined at this time.
8	The Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma, the Public Employees' Retirement System of Mississippi, Raiffeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenfonds ABP (Lead Plaintiffs in <i>In re Delphi Corp. Securities Litigation</i>)	1161	11/23/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KECP should be denied because Debtors seek to reward executives who "knowingly participated in Delphi's massive accounting fraud, or who inexcusably tolerated or ignored that fraud as it impelled the Company's slide toward bankruptcy." • "If not denied outright, the KECP Motion should not be entertained before the Debtors produce evidence showing just what the intended beneficiaries of the plan did, and did not do, as Delphi engaged in its pervasive accounting chicanery." • KECP does not constitute the exercise of sound business judgment. Delphi should not reward the executives whose conduct precipitated the Debtors' collapse and necessitated these cases. Objection identifies specific executives and provides allegations of wrongdoing. • KECP lacks adequate factual support. Recent executive departures cited as a basis for the KECP were in fact the result of Delphi's accounting fraud, not these chapter 11 cases. • KECP lacks vital detail, including executives covered and methodology used to select participants. • EBITDAR targets have not yet been set by the Compensation Committee. • Absence of a minimum sale price is contrary to sound business judgment.

Tab	Objecting Party	Docket No.	Date of ECF Filing	Summary of Objection
9	International Union of Electronic, Electrical, Salaried, Machine and Furniture Workers-Communications Workers of America	1164	11/23/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KECP will hinder Debtors' ability to reorganize. Approval of KECP is inequitable and will harm labor negotiations. • Motion should be deferred to the end of these chapter 11 cases. • KECP would be prohibited under amended Bankruptcy Code. KECP is a retention program. • Debtors are not entitled to business judgment rule's presumption. Debtors cannot demonstrate due care, informed judgment, good faith or disinterestedness. • The purported 5% attrition rate of executives does not warrant a costly executive retention program. Recent departure of executives could be for numerous reasons and may not be an indication of future departures. • CEO's "opt-out" from KECP demonstrates that KECP is not necessary to retain or incentivize executives. Reward should be determined later based on merit of executives' performance. KECP is not performance-based. • Management did not keep pace with industry because management failed to meet incentive targets. Chapter 11 cases should not be the opportunity for management to catch up to industry peers. • Approval of KECP at this time is inequitable and may harm labor negotiations.

Tab	Objecting Party	Docket No.	Date of ECF Filing	Summary of Objection
10	United States Trustee	1288	11/28/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Debtors have not provided sufficient evidence that KECP is an exercise of their sound business judgment. Debtors do not supply evidence that: (i) supports conclusion that executive pay is below market; and (ii) explains why executives left in 12 months before bankruptcy. Debtors fail to show the relevance "of a retention plan for executives who led a company that was unprofitable for most of the years of its independent existence." KECP is unfair, unreasonable and premature. It is "patently unfair and unreasonable for the Debtors to seek to grant executives large bonuses and equity shares at the expense of the other employees." Debtors should operate in chapter 11 for several months, implement cost-cutting measures, and assess their financial future before determining whether KECP is appropriate.
11	Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors	2099	02/06/06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised AIP should not be approved before labor negotiations have been successfully concluded. Debtors' decision to seek approval of executive bonuses within one week of the expected motions under sections 1113 and 1114 of the Code is not a reasonable or justifiable exercise of business judgment. To the extent a performance incentive plan is approved by the Court over the Committee's objection as to timing, the Committee does not object to the form and substance of the Revised AIP.

EXHIBIT B

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----x
: In re : Chapter 11
: :
: DELPHI CORPORATION, et al., : Case No. 05-44481 (RDD)
: :
: Debtors. : (Jointly Administered)
: :
-----x

ORDER UNDER 11 U.S.C. §§ 105 AND 363 AUTHORIZING THE DEBTORS TO
IMPLEMENT A SHORT-TERM ANNUAL INCENTIVE PROGRAM AS PART OF A
KEY EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION PROGRAM

("KECP-AIP ORDER")

Upon the motion, dated October 13, 2005 (Docket No. 213), of Delphi Corporation and certain of its domestic subsidiaries and affiliates, debtors and debtors-in-possession in the above-captioned cases (collectively, the "Debtors"), for an order under 11 U.S.C. §§ 105(a) and 363(b)(1) authorizing the Debtors to implement a key employee compensation program (the "KECP Motion"), outstanding for 120 days, and the hearing of which was adjourned from November 29, 2005, to January 5, 2006, to January 27, 2006, and to February 10, 2006, to address issues raised by the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors (the "Creditors' Committee"); and upon the Declarations of Mark R. Weber, Nick Bubnovich, and John D. Opie, sworn to February 1, 2006; and upon the Supplemental Declaration of Mark R. Weber, sworn to February 7, 2006; and upon the Debtors' agreement with the Creditors' Committee that the February 10, 2006 omnibus hearing be limited to the portion of the revised annual incentive plan (the "Revised AIP") commencing on January 1, 2006, and continuing through June 30, 2006 (the "Performance Period"); and upon the Debtors' agreement with the

Creditors' Committee to defer until the July 27, 2006, omnibus hearing all portions of the KECP relating to future periods of the Revised AIP and the cash and equity components of the emergence incentive compensation plan; and upon the Creditors' Committee's statement that all of its objections to the Revised AIP currently before the Court have been consensually resolved with the Debtors except as to timing of the relief requested; and upon no objector to the KECP Motion presenting evidence questioning the form and substance of the Revised AIP currently before the Court; and after consideration of the objections filed by Wilmington Trust Company (as Indenture Trustee) (Docket No. 1133); the United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers, International Union (USW), AFL-CIO (Docket No. 1134); the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (Docket No. 1135); the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (Docket No. 1141); the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Union No. 663 and the International Association of Machinists, AFL-CIO Tool and Die Makers Local Lodge 78, District 10 (Docket No. 1156); JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A., as administrative agent, for itself and a syndicate of approximately 250 senior secured lenders (Limited Objection of Prepetition Lenders) (Docket No. 1157); the International Union of Operating Engineers Local Union Nos. 18, 101, and 832 (Docket No. 1159); The Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma, the Public Employees' Retirement System of Mississippi, Raiffeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenfonds ABP (Lead Plaintiffs in *In re Delphi Corp. Securities Litigation*) (Docket No. 1161); the International Union of Electronic, Electrical, Salaried, Machine and Furniture Workers-Communications Workers of America (Docket No. 1164); the United States Trustee (Docket No. 1288); and the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors (Limited Objection) (Docket No. 2099) (collectively, the "Objections"); and the

declarations of Henry Reichard (in support of the objection by the IUE-CWA) (Docket No. 1168), Steve A. Grandstaff (in support of the objection by the UAW) (Docket No. 1135), and Mark Shaw (in support of the objection by the USW) (Docket No. 2054); and upon the record of the hearing held on the Motion; and this Court having determined that the relief requested in the Motion is in the best interests of the Debtors, their estates, their creditors, and other parties-in-interest; and it appearing that proper and adequate notice of the Motion has been given and that no other or further notice is necessary; and after due deliberation thereon; and good and sufficient cause appearing therefor,

IT IS HEREBY FOUND AND DETERMINED THAT:

A. Implementation of the portion of the Revised AIP currently before the Court covering the Performance Period is, as a matter of fact, a transaction in the ordinary course of business, within the meaning of 11 U.S.C. § 363(c);

B. In addition to and in the alternative to its finding in the immediately preceding paragraph, it is the Court's business judgment, in reviewing the manner in which the Debtors seek to manage the Debtors' estates, that the Debtors have exercised a reasonable business judgment in seeking to implement at this time the portion of the Revised AIP covering the Performance Period;

C. The portion of the Revised AIP currently before the Court, including the Debtors' proposal to implement it now, was proposed in good faith and is in all respects fair and reasonable, including its allowance of incentive compensation payments, at target, to all executives under the program totaling approximately \$20.6 million, \$5.7 million of which amount may represent incentive compensation payments, at target, to members of Delphi's Strategy Board;

D. The Court finds that the safe harbor or prophylactic measures agreed to by the Debtors and the Creditors' Committee as set forth in paragraph 11 of this Order are reasonably adequate to protect the property of the Debtors' Estates; and

E. The implementation at this time of the Revised AIP covering the Performance Period is in the best interest of the Debtors, their estates, creditors, and parties-in-interest and is necessary to the Debtors' reorganization efforts.

ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED THAT:

1. The Motion, solely as it relates to the implementation of a revised Annual Incentive Program for the period ending June 30, 2006, is GRANTED; the objections thereto are OVERRULED; and the remainder of the KECP relating to future periods of the Revised AIP and the cash and equity components of the Emergence Incentive Plan in the Motion and any objections thereto are ADJOURNED to the July 27, 2006, omnibus hearing .

2. Implementation of the Revised AIP covering the Performance Period is, as a matter of law, a transaction in the ordinary course of business, within the meaning of 11 U.S.C. § 363(b)(1), for which Court approval is not required.

3. In addition to and in the alternative to the decree and conclusion of law set forth in the immediately preceding paragraph, and mindful that this Court sits as an "overseer of the wisdom with which the bankruptcy estate's property is being managed by the . . . debtor-in-possession," that the Court must resist becoming the "arbiter of disputes between creditors and the estate," and that consideration of a debtor's Section 363(b) motion is a summary proceeding, intended merely as a means to "efficiently review the . . . debtor's decision[s] . . . in the course of the swift administration of the bankruptcy estate" and "not the time or place for prolonged discovery or a lengthy trial with disputed issues," Orion Pictures Corp. v. Showtime Pictures

Corp. (In re Orion Pictures Corp.), 4 F.3d 1095, 1098–99 (2d Cir. 1993), the Court approves in all respects the implementation at this time of the Revised AIP covering the Performance Period, and the Debtors are authorized, pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 105(a) and 363(b)(1), to forthwith take all actions necessary to implement the Revised AIP on the terms and conditions set forth in the following paragraphs of this Order.

4. The Revised AIP shall apply to the individuals holding executive positions with the Debtors in the United States during the Performance Period (the "Covered Employees"), excluding, by his voluntary agreement, the current Chairman and CEO, Robert S. ("Steve") Miller. A Covered Employee who quits or is terminated for cause will not be eligible for any incentive compensation payment. If a Covered Employee is terminated involuntarily and not for cause, he or she is eligible to receive a pro rata payment, which the Debtors may pay as soon as reasonably practicable following the end of the Performance Period. The same principle shall apply with respect to a Covered Employee whose employment is terminated because of death or disability. Covered Employees hired during the Performance Period may receive incentive compensation payments on a prorated basis.

5. Performance at the corporate level shall be measured using an "EBITDAR-UG" performance metric. EBITDAR-UG means earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation, amortization, and restructuring costs, but excluding earnings resulting from the ongoing negotiations with the Debtors' labor unions (the "U") or General Motors Corporation (the "G"). Performance at the division level shall be measured using an OIBITDAR-UG performance metric, where the "OI" represents operating income.

6. The EBITDAR-UG target for the Revised AIP covering the Performance Period shall be set at a negative \$80 million. The OIBITDAR-UG targets for the Revised AIP

covering the Performance Period shall be, as follows: (i) Energy and Chassis = - \$44.2 million; (ii) Steering = - \$92.8 million; (iii) Thermal and Interior = - \$79.2 million; (iv) Electronics and Safety = \$193.0 million; (v) Packard = \$83.4 million; (vi) Product and Service Solution = \$23.1 million; (vii) Automotive Holdings Group = - \$583.9 million; and (viii) Medical = \$0.3 million.

7. At the corporate level, 100% of Covered Employees' incentive compensation payment opportunities shall be based on the corporate level target. At the division level (except the Medical division), 50% of a Covered Employee's incentive compensation payment opportunity shall be based on the corporate level target and 50% shall be based on the applicable division level target. In the Medical division, 30% of a Covered Employee's incentive compensation payment opportunity shall be based on the corporate level target and 70% is based on the Medical division target. Covered Employees who transfer between entities or across divisions within the same entity shall have their opportunities prorated based upon the time at each entity during the Performance Period. The corporate and division targets shall independent of one another, and achievement of one target may result in the funding of one even if the other target is not achieved.

8. Target incentive compensation payment opportunities for Covered Employees, by Band, shall be in accordance with the spreadsheet attached hereto as Exhibit 1, and the range of incentive compensation payment opportunities for Covered Employees shall be based on the payout curves attached hereto as Exhibit 2.

9. The Debtors shall be and hereby are authorized to make individual performance adjustments to incentive compensation payments earned by Covered Employees. Covered Employees designated as poor performers or otherwise not meeting expectations, as determined by their supervisors, shall receive no incentive compensation payment. Participants

may have their incentive payments adjusted by any amount up to as much as 200% of target, provided however, that the incentive payments of members of the Delphi Strategy Board (the "DSB") shall be capped at 150% of target. The net effect to the Debtors of these individual adjustments must be zero, i.e., a positive individual achievement adjustment for one executive must be counterbalanced by negative individual achievement adjustments for one or more other executives. Additionally, a DSB-level incentive-compensation payment adjustment cannot be funded by (or fund) an adjustment to a non-DSB-level incentive compensation payment, and vice versa.

10. The following safe harbor (or prophylactic) provisions shall apply to all participants of the Debtors' KECP including the Revised AIP:

(a) A KECP participant's unpaid KECP payments shall be escrowed by the Debtors pending a final determination whether those payments should be forfeited pursuant to the forfeiture/clawback procedures and standards set forth below (which determination shall be made in no event later than the effective date of a plan of reorganization unless, for good cause shown with respect to that individual participant, this Court extends the period of the escrow), in the event that the Debtors assert a claim (or the Creditors' Committee notifies the Debtors that the Creditors' Committee intends to obtain from the Court authority to file a complaint against that participant; provided that the escrow payments shall be released if the Creditors' Committee does not obtain such authority within 45 days of the notice to the Debtors or does not file such complaint within ten days after obtaining such authority) for relief under the Bankruptcy Code or other applicable law in connection with conduct or transactions relating to the participant's employment or affiliation with the Debtors.

(b) As a further safe harbor and while the Debtors have no present information or belief that such events are reasonably likely to occur, KECP payments shall be escrowed by the Debtors in the event that a KECP participant, with respect to conduct or transactions relating to the participant's employment or affiliation with the Debtors: (i) is given notice of the participant's right to make a Wells submission by the Securities and Exchange Commission; (ii) is sued or is informed, or the Debtors are informed, that the participant will, in the near future, be sued by the Securities and Exchange Commission; (iii) is notified, or the Debtors are notified, that the participant is a target of a criminal investigation; (iv) is indicted or agrees to the filing of a criminal information against the participant; or (v) declines to answer questions on grounds of the participant's Fifth Amendment rights against self-incrimination.

(c) A KECP participant's KECP escrow payment shall be forfeited (or if the KECP payment was not escrowed the participant shall be required to repay to the Debtors whatever the participant received under the KECP) and the participant will not be entitled to receive any further KECP benefits if it is ultimately determined that, with respect to conduct or transactions relating to the participant's employment or affiliation with the Debtors, the participant failed to act in good faith and in a manner the Debtors reasonably believe to have been in or not opposed to the best interests of the Debtors. The Debtors' clawback claim against a KECP participant may be offset without further order of this Court against any claim of any kind that the KECP participant may have against the Debtors including (but not limited to) any claim for indemnification.

(d) Any determination under the immediately preceding paragraph shall be made by the Board of Directors of Delphi Corporation, after notice to the Creditors' Committee and the participant and an opportunity to be heard by the participant, pursuant to the

procedures set forth in the Debtors' bylaws, subject to the Creditors' Committee right to object to (based on the Creditors' Committee's review of the record) and, upon such objection, this Court's de novo review of the Debtors' determination with respect to any particular individual.

11. Any payments to which a Covered Employee is entitled under the Revised AIP shall be accorded administrative expense status and priority under 11 U.S.C. §§ 503(b)(1)(A) and 507(a)(1).

12. This Court shall retain jurisdiction over the Debtors and the Covered Employees participating in the Revised AIP covering the Performance Period, including without limitation for the purposes of interpreting, implementing, and enforcing the terms and conditions of the Revised AIP.

13. The requirement under Rule 9013-1(b) of the Local Rules for the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York for the service and filing of a separate memorandum of law is deemed satisfied by the Motion and the Omnibus Reply.

Dated: New York, New York
February __, 2006

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

EXHIBIT 1

RANGE OF BONUS OPPORTUNITIES FOR AIP PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS (Jan. 1, 2006, through June 30, 2006).


	HC	Avg. Salary	Targets thru	Individual Performance			Individual Performance			Individual Performance Ranges		
			6/30/06	Ranges (threshold)			Ranges (target)			(maximum)		
				Min	Mid Point	Max	Min	Mid Point	Max	Min	Mid Point	Max
<u>DSB</u>												
Miller		\$1	Not Participating									
Other DSB		\$514,255	\$256,933	\$0	\$102,773	\$154,160	\$0	\$256,933	\$385,399	\$0	\$385,399	\$385,399
Sum	23		\$5,652,522	*	\$2,261,009	**	*	\$5,652,522	**	\$0	\$8,478,783	\$8,478,783
<u>Band F</u>												
		\$427,500	\$122,500	\$0	\$49,000	\$98,000	\$0	\$122,500	\$245,000	\$0	\$245,000	\$245,000
Sum	2		\$245,000	*	\$98,000	**	*	\$245,000	**	\$0	\$490,000	\$490,000
Band E	21	\$292,808	\$85,500	\$0	\$34,200	\$68,400	\$0	\$85,500	\$171,000	\$0	\$171,000	\$171,000
Band D	65	\$240,799	\$67,500	\$0	\$27,000	\$54,000	\$0	\$67,500	\$135,000	\$0	\$135,000	\$135,000
Band C	88	\$199,856	\$33,500	\$0	\$13,400	\$26,800	\$0	\$33,500	\$67,000	\$0	\$67,000	\$67,000
Band B	130	\$165,312	\$23,500	\$0	\$9,400	\$18,800	\$0	\$23,500	\$47,000	\$0	\$47,000	\$47,000
Band A	138	\$141,300	\$18,500	\$0	\$7,400	\$14,800	\$0	\$18,500	\$37,000	\$0	\$37,000	\$37,000
Sum	442		\$14,739,000	*	\$5,895,600	**	*	\$14,739,000	**	\$0	\$29,478,000	\$29,478,000
TOTAL COST	467		\$20,636,522	*	\$8,254,609	**	*	\$20,636,522	**	\$0	\$38,446,783	\$38,446,783

* Individual bonuses may be reduced to as low as zero based on performance.

** While individuals can receive up to 200% of their target bonus (150% for DSB) based on individual performance, the total pool cannot exceed the aggregate midpoint amount.

<u>\$ Fund Summary</u>	<u>Threshold</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
	<i>\$M</i>	<i>\$M</i>	<i>\$M</i>
Original Proposal	\$12.4	\$31.0	\$62.0
Revised Proposal	\$8.3	\$20.6	\$38.4
DSB Original	\$3.4	\$8.5	\$17.0
DSB Revised	\$2.3	\$5.7	\$8.5


EXHIBIT 2



* Targets do not include any possible GM contribution or results of modifications of labor agreements.

% Performance	\$ Performance (in millions)	Current	DSB % Payout	Non-DSB % Payout
69%	\$0	0	0	0
70%	(\$207)	40%	20%	20%
75%	(\$186)	50%	25%	25%
80%	(\$165)	60%	35%	35%
85%	(\$144)	70%	45%	45%
90%	(\$123)	80%	55%	55%
95%	(\$102)	90%	75%	75%
100%	(\$81)	100%	100%	100%
101%	(\$77)	101%	102%	103%
110%	(\$39)	110%	115%	125%
120%	\$3	120%	125%	145%
130%	\$45	130%	135%	165%
131%	\$49	131%	136%	166%
140%	\$87	140%	145%	170%
150%	\$129	150%	150%	175%
151%	\$133	151%	150%	177%
160%	\$171	160%	150%	180%
170%	\$213	170%	150%	185%
180%	\$255	180%	150%	190%
190%	\$297	190%	150%	195%
200%	\$340	200%	150%	200%

Revised Proposed E&C AIP Payout Curve



OIBITDAR (000s)*	Minimum	Target	Maximum
Payout %	(\$72.8)	(\$44.2)	\$54.3
Performance %	20%	100%	200%


* Targets do not include any possible GM contribution or results of modifications of labor agreements.

E&C

\$ Performance (in millions)	% Performance	Non-DSB % Payout	Non-DSB % Payout
(\$72.7)	69%	0	0
(\$72.8)	70%	20%	20%
(\$68.0)	75%	25%	25%
(\$63.3)	80%	35%	35%
(\$58.5)	85%	45%	45%
(\$53.7)	90%	55%	55%
(\$49.0)	95%	75%	75%
(\$44.2)	100%	100%	100%
(\$43.2)	101%	103%	103%
(\$34.4)	110%	125%	125%
(\$24.5)	120%	145%	145%
(\$14.7)	130%	165%	165%
(\$13.7)	131%	166%	166%
(\$4.8)	140%	170%	170%
\$5.0	150%	175%	175%
\$6.0	151%	177%	177%
\$14.9	160%	180%	180%
\$24.7	170%	185%	185%
\$34.6	180%	190%	190%
\$44.4	190%	195%	195%
\$54.3	200%	200%	200%

DELPHI 005169
CONFIDENTIAL

Revised Proposed Steering AIP Payout Curve



	Minimum	Target	Maximum
OIBITDAR (000s)*	(\$102.8)	(\$92.8)	(\$58.3)
Payout %	20%	100%	200%
Performance %	70%	100%	200%


* Targets do not include any possible GM contribution or results of modifications of labor agreements.

Steering

\$ Performance (in millions)	% Performance	Non-DSB % Payout	Non-DSB % Payout
(\$102.7)	69%	0	0
(\$102.8)	70%	20%	20%
(\$101.1)	75%	25%	25%
(\$99.4)	80%	35%	35%
(\$97.8)	85%	45%	45%
(\$96.1)	90%	55%	55%
(\$94.4)	95%	75%	75%
(\$92.8)	100%	100%	100%
(\$92.4)	101%	103%	103%
(\$89.3)	110%	125%	125%
(\$85.9)	120%	145%	145%
(\$82.4)	130%	165%	165%
(\$82.1)	131%	166%	166%
(\$79.0)	140%	170%	170%
(\$75.5)	150%	175%	175%
(\$75.2)	151%	177%	177%
(\$72.1)	160%	180%	180%
(\$68.6)	170%	185%	185%
(\$65.2)	180%	190%	190%
(\$61.7)	190%	195%	195%
(\$58.3)	200%	200%	200%

DELPHI 005170
CONFIDENTIAL

Revised Proposed T&I AIP Payout Curve



	Minimum	Target	Maximum
OIBITDAR (000s)*	(\$94.8)	(\$79.2)	(\$25.3)
Payout %	20%	100%	200%
Performance %	70%	100%	200%


* Targets do not include any possible GM contribution or results of modifications of labor agreements.

T&I

\$ Performance (in millions)	% Performance	Non-DSB % Payout	Non-DSB % Payout
(\$94.7)	69%	0	0
(\$94.8)	70%	20%	20%
(\$92.2)	75%	25%	25%
(\$89.6)	80%	35%	35%
(\$87.0)	85%	45%	45%
(\$84.4)	90%	55%	55%
(\$81.8)	95%	75%	75%
(\$79.2)	100%	100%	100%
(\$78.7)	101%	103%	103%
(\$73.8)	110%	125%	125%
(\$68.4)	120%	145%	145%
(\$63.0)	130%	165%	165%
(\$62.5)	131%	166%	166%
(\$57.7)	140%	170%	170%
(\$52.3)	150%	175%	175%
(\$51.7)	151%	177%	177%
(\$46.9)	160%	180%	180%
(\$41.5)	170%	185%	185%
(\$36.1)	180%	190%	190%
(\$30.7)	190%	195%	195%
(\$25.3)	200%	200%	200%

DELPHI 005171
CONFIDENTIAL

Revised Proposed E&S AIP Payout Curve




OIBITDAR (000s)*	Minimum	Target	Maximum
Payout %	\$167.9	\$193.0	\$279.4
Performance %	20%	100%	200%

* Targets do not include any possible GM contribution or results of modifications of labor agreements.

\$ Performance (in millions)	% Performance	Non-DSB % Payout	Non-DSB % Payout
\$167.8	69%	0	0
\$167.9	70%	20%	20%
\$172.1	75%	25%	25%
\$176.3	80%	35%	35%
\$180.5	85%	45%	45%
\$184.6	90%	55%	55%
\$188.8	95%	75%	75%
\$193.0	100%	100%	100%
\$193.9	101%	103%	103%
\$201.6	110%	125%	125%
\$210.3	120%	145%	145%
\$218.9	130%	165%	165%
\$219.8	131%	166%	166%
\$227.6	140%	170%	170%
\$236.2	150%	175%	175%
\$237.1	151%	177%	177%
\$244.9	160%	180%	180%
\$253.5	170%	185%	185%
\$262.1	180%	190%	190%
\$270.8	190%	195%	195%
\$279.4	200%	200%	200%

E&S

Revised Proposed P AIP Payout Curve



	Minimum	Target	Maximum
OIBITDAR (000s)*	\$57.1	\$83.4	\$174.1
Payout %	20%	100%	200%
Performance %	70%	100%	200%


* Targets do not include any possible GM contribution or results of modifications of labor agreements.

Packard

\$ Performance (in millions)	% Performance	Non-DSB % Payout	Non-DSB % Payout
\$57.0	69%	0	0
\$57.1	70%	20%	20%
\$61.5	75%	25%	25%
\$65.9	80%	35%	35%
\$70.2	85%	45%	45%
\$74.6	90%	55%	55%
\$79.0	95%	75%	75%
\$83.4	100%	100%	100%
\$84.3	101%	103%	103%
\$92.5	110%	125%	125%
\$101.5	120%	145%	145%
\$110.6	130%	165%	165%
\$111.5	131%	166%	166%
\$119.7	140%	170%	170%
\$128.7	150%	175%	175%
\$129.6	151%	177%	177%
\$137.8	160%	180%	180%
\$146.9	170%	185%	185%
\$155.9	180%	190%	190%
\$165.0	190%	195%	195%
\$174.1	200%	200%	200%

DELPHI 005173
CONFIDENTIAL

Revised Proposed PSS AIP Payout Curve



OIBITDAR (000s)*	Minimum	Target	Maximum
Payout %	\$14.4	\$23.1	\$53.0
Performance %	20%	100%	200%

* Targets do not include any possible GM contribution or results of modifications of labor agreements.

\$ Performance (in millions)	% Performance	Non-DSB % Payout	Non-DSB % Payout
\$14.3	69%	0	0
\$14.4	70%	20%	20%
\$15.9	75%	25%	25%
\$17.3	80%	35%	35%
\$18.8	85%	45%	45%
\$20.2	90%	55%	55%
\$21.7	95%	75%	75%
\$23.1	100%	100%	100%
\$23.4	101%	103%	103%
\$26.1	110%	125%	125%
\$29.1	120%	145%	145%
\$32.1	130%	165%	165%
\$32.4	131%	166%	166%
\$35.1	140%	170%	170%
\$38.0	150%	175%	175%
\$38.3	151%	177%	177%
\$41.0	160%	180%	180%
\$44.0	170%	185%	185%
\$47.0	180%	190%	190%
\$50.0	190%	195%	195%
\$53.0	200%	200%	200%

Revised Proposed AHG AIP Payout Curve




	Minimum	Target	Maximum
OIBITDAR (000s)*	(\$592.1)	(\$583.9)	(\$555.6)
Payout %	20%	100%	200%
Performance %	70%	100%	200%

* Targets do not include any possible GM contribution or results of modifications of labor agreements.

AHG

\$ Performance (in millions)	% Performance	Non-DSB % Payout	Non-DSB % Payout
(\$592.0)	69%	0	0
(\$592.1)	70%	20%	20%
(\$590.8)	75%	25%	25%
(\$589.4)	80%	35%	35%
(\$588.0)	85%	45%	45%
(\$586.6)	90%	55%	55%
(\$585.3)	95%	75%	75%
(\$583.9)	100%	100%	100%
(\$583.6)	101%	103%	103%
(\$581.1)	110%	125%	125%
(\$578.2)	120%	145%	145%
(\$575.4)	130%	165%	165%
(\$575.1)	131%	166%	166%
(\$572.6)	140%	170%	170%
(\$569.7)	150%	175%	175%
(\$569.5)	151%	177%	177%
(\$566.9)	160%	180%	180%
(\$564.1)	170%	185%	185%
(\$561.2)	180%	190%	190%
(\$558.4)	190%	195%	195%
(\$555.6)	200%	200%	200%

Revised Proposed Medical AIP Payout Curve



OIBITDAR (000s)*	Minimum	Target	Maximum
Payout %	\$0.2	\$0.3	\$0.6
Performance %	20%	100%	200%

* Targets do not include any possible GM contribution or results of modifications of labor agreements.

Medical

\$ Performance (in millions)	% Performance	Non-DSB % Payout	Non-DSB % Payout
\$0.2	69%	0	0
\$0.2	70%	20%	20%
\$0.2	75%	25%	25%
\$0.2	80%	35%	35%
\$0.3	85%	45%	45%
\$0.3	90%	55%	55%
\$0.3	95%	75%	75%
\$0.3	100%	100%	100%
\$0.3	101%	103%	103%
\$0.3	110%	125%	125%
\$0.4	120%	145%	145%
\$0.4	130%	165%	165%
\$0.4	131%	166%	166%
\$0.4	140%	170%	170%
\$0.4	150%	175%	175%
\$0.5	151%	177%	177%
\$0.5	160%	180%	180%
\$0.5	170%	185%	185%
\$0.5	180%	190%	190%
\$0.6	190%	195%	195%
\$0.6	200%	200%	200%

EXHIBIT C

COMPANY	CONTACT	ADDRESS1	ADDRESS2	CITY	STATE	ZIP	PHONE	FAX	EMAIL	PARTY / FUNCTION
Brown Rudnick Berlack Israels LLP	Robert J. Stark	Seven Times Square		New York	NY	10036	212-209-4800	212-2094801	rstark@brownrudnick.com	Indenture Trustee
Capital Research and Management Company	Michelle Robson	11100 Santa Monica Blvd	15th Floor	Los Angeles	CA	90025	310-996-6140	310-996-6091	mlfr@capgroup.com	Creditor Committee Member
Cohen Weiss & Simon	Bruce Simon	330 W. 42nd Street		New York	NY	10036	212-356-0231	212-695-5436	b.simon@cwsny.com	
Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt & Mosle LLP	Steven J. Reisman	101 Park Avenue		New York	NY	10178-0061	2126966000	2126971559	sreisman@cm-p.com	Counsel for Flextronics International USA, Inc.
Davis Polk & Wardwell	Donald Bernstein	450 Lexington Avenue		New York	NY	10017	212-450-4092	212-450-3092	donald.bernstein@dpw.com	Postpetition Administrative Agent
Delphi Corporation	Sean Corcoran, Karen Craft	5725 Delphi Drive		Troy	MI	48098	248-813-2000	248-813-2670	sean.p.corcoran@delphi.com karen.j.craft@delphi.com	Debtors
Electronic Data Systems Corp.	Michael Nefkens	5505 Corporate Drive MSIA		Troy	MI	48098	248-696-1729	248-696-1739	mike.nefkens@eds.com	Creditor Committee Member
Flextronics International	Carrie L. Schiff	6328 Monarch Park Place		Niwot	CO	80503	303-652-4853	303-652-4716	cschiff@flextronics.com	Counsel for Flextronics International
Flextronics International	Terry Zale	6328 Monarch Park Place		Niwot	CO	80503	303-652-4853	303-652-4716	terryzale@flextronics.com	Counsel for Flextronics International
Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.	Richard Lee Chambers, III	6501 William Cannon Drive West	MD: OE16	Austin	TX	78735	512-895-6357	512-895-3090	trey_chambers@freescale.com	Creditor Committee Member
FTI Consulting, Inc.	Randall S. Eisenberg	3 Times Square	11th Floor	New York	NY	10036	212-2471010	212-841-9350	randall.eisenberg@fticonsulting.com	Financial Advisors to Debtors
General Electric Company	Valerie Venable	9930 Kinsey Avenue		Huntersville	NC	28078	704-992-5075	866-585-2386		Creditor Committee Member
Groom Law Group	Lonie A. Hassel	1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW		Washington	DC	20006	202-857-0620	202-659-4503	lhassel@groom.com	Counsel for Employee Benefits
Hodgson Russ LLP	Stephen H. Gross	152 West 57th Street	35th Floor	New York	NY	10019	212-751-4300	212-751-0928	sgross@hodgsonruss.com	Counsel for Hexcel Corporation
Honigman Miller Schwartz and Cohn LLP	Frank L. Gorman, Esq.	2290 First National Building	660 Woodward Avenue	Detroit	MI	48226-3583	313-465-7000	313-465-8000	fgorman@honigman.com	Counsel to General Motors Corporation
Honigman Miller Schwartz and Cohn LLP	Robert B. Weiss, Esq.	2290 First National Building	660 Woodward Avenue	Detroit	MI	48226-3583	313-465-7000	313-465-8000	rweiss@honigman.com	Counsel to General Motors Corporation
Internal Revenue Service	Attn: Insolvency Department, Mario Valerio	290 Broadway	5th Floor	New York	NY	10007	212-298-2015	212-298-2016		IRS
Internal Revenue Service	Attn: Insolvency Department	477 Michigan Ave	Mail Stop 15	Detroit	MI	48226	313-628-3648	313-628-3602		Michigan IRS
IUE-CWA	Henry Reichard	2360 W. Dorothy Lane	Suite 201	Dayton	OH	45439	937-294-7813	937-294-9164	hreicharduecwa@aol.com	Creditor Committee Member
Jefferies & Company, Inc.	William Q. Derrough	520 Madison Avenue	12th Floor	New York	NY	10022	212-284-2521	212-284-2470	bderrough@jefferies.com thomas.fmaher@chase.com richard.duker@jpmorgan.com gianni.russello@jpmorgan.com	UCC Professional
JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.	Thomas F. Maher, Richard Duker, Gianni Russello	270 Park Avenue		New York	NY	10017	212-270-0426	212-270-0430		Postpetition Administrative Agent
JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.	Vilma Francis	270 Park Avenue		New York	NY	10017	212-270-5484	212-270-4016	vilma.francis@jpmorgan.com	Prepetition Administrative Agent
Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel LLP	Gordon Z. Novod	1177 Avenue of the Americas		New York	NY	10036	212-715-9100	212-715-8000	gnovod@kramerlevin.com	Counsel Data Systems Corporation; EDS Information Services, LLC
Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel LLP	Thomas Moers Mayer	1177 Avenue of the Americas		New York	NY	10036	212-715-9100	212-715-8000	tmayer@kramerlevin.com	Counsel Data Systems Corporation; EDS Information Services, LLC
Kurtzman Carson Consultants	James Le	12910 Culver Blvd.	Suite I	Los Angeles	CA	90066	310-751-1511	310-751-1561	jle@kcccllc.com	Noticing and Claims Agent:
Latham & Watkins LLP	Robert J. Rosenberg	885 Third Avenue		New York	NY	10022	212-906-1370	212-751-4864	robert.rosenberg@lw.com	UCC Professional
Law Debenture Trust of New York	Patrick J. Healy	767 Third Ave.	31st Floor	New York	NY	10017	212-750-6474	212-750-1361	patrick.healy@lawdeb.com	Indenture Trustee
Law Debenture Trust of New York	Daniel R. Fisher	767 Third Ave.	31st Floor	New York	NY	10017	212-750-6474	212-750-1361	daniel.fisher@lawdeb.com	Indenture Trustee
McDermott Will & Emery LLP	David D. Cleary	227 West Monroe Street		Chicago	IL	60606	312-372-2000	312-984-7700	dcleary@mwe.com	Counsel for Rectical North America, Inc.
McDermott Will & Emery LLP	Mohsin N. Khambati	227 West Monroe Street		Chicago	IL	60606	312-372-2000	312-984-7700	mkhambati@mwe.com	Counsel for Rectical North America, Inc.
										Counsel for Movant Retirees and Proposed Counsel for The Official Committee of Retirees
McTigue Law Firm	J. Brian McTigue	5301 Wisconsin Ave. N.W.	Suite 350	Washington	DC	20015	202-364-6900	202-364-9960	bmctigue@mctiguelaw.com	Counsel for Movant Retirees and Proposed Counsel for The Official Committee of Retirees
McTigue Law Firm	Cornish F. Hitchcock	5301 Wisconsin Ave. N.W.	Suite 350	Washington	DC	20015	202-364-6900	202-364-9960	conh@mctiguelaw.com	Counsel for Movant Retirees and Proposed Counsel for The Official Committee of Retirees

COMPANY	CONTACT	ADDRESS1	ADDRESS2	CITY	STATE	ZIP	PHONE	FAX	EMAIL	PARTY / FUNCTION
Mesirow Financial	Melissa Knolls	321 N. Clark St.	13th Floor	Chicago	IL	60601	800-453-0600	312-644-8927	mknoll@mesirrowfinancial.com	UCC Professional
Morrison Cohen LLP	Joseph T. Moldovan, Esq.	909 Third Avenue		New York	NY	10022	2127358603	9175223103	jmoldovan@morrisoncohen.com	Counsel for Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Michigan
Northeast Regional Office	Mark Schonfeld, Regional Director	3 World Financial Center	Room 4300	New York	NY	10281	212-336-1100	212-336-1323	newyork@sec.gov	Securities and Exchange Commission
Office of New York State	Attorney General Eliot Spitzer	120 Broadway		New York City	NY	10271	212-416-8000	212-416-6075		New York Attorney General's Office
O'Melveny & Meyer LLP	Robert Siegel	400 South Hope Street		Los Angeles	CA	90071	213-430-6000	213-430-6407	rsiegel@omm.com	Special Labor Counsel
O'Melveny & Meyer LLP	Tom A. Jerman, Rachel Janger	1625 Eye Street, NW		Washington	DC	20006	202-383-5300	202-383-5414	tjerman@omm.com	Special Labor Counsel
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation	Jeffrey Cohen	1200 K Street, N.W.	Suite 340	Washington	DC	20005	202-326-4020	202-326-4112	garnick.sandra@pbqc.gov efile@pbqc.gov	Counsel for Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation	Ralph L. Landy	1200 K Street, N.W.	Suite 340	Washington	DC	20005-4026	2023264020	2023264112	landy.ralph@pbqc.gov	Chief Counsel for the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation
Phillips Nizer LLP	Sandra A. Riemer	666 Fifth Avenue		New York	NY	10103	212-841-0589	212-262-5152	sriemer@phillipsnizer.com	Counsel for Freescale Semiconductor, Inc., f/k/a Motorola Semiconductor Systems
Rothchild Inc.	David L. Resnick	1251 Avenue of the Americas		New York	NY	10020	212-403-3500	212-403-5454	david.resnick@us.rothschild.com	Financial Advisor
Seyfarth Shaw LLP	Robert W. Dremluk	1270 Avenue of the Americas	Suite 2500	New York	NY	10020-1801	2122185500	2122185526	rdremluk@seyfarth.com	Counsel for Murata Electronics North
Shearman & Sterling LLP	Douglas Bartner, Jill Frizzley	599 Lexington Avenue		New York	NY	10022	212-8484000	212-848-7179	dbartner@shearman.com jfrizzley@shearman.com	Local Counsel to the Debtors
Simpson Thatcher & Bartlett LLP	Kenneth S. Ziman, Robert H. Trust, William T. Russell, Jr.	425 Lexington Avenue		New York	NY	10017	212-455-2000	212-455-2502	kziman@stblaw.com rtrust@stblaw.com wrussell@stblaw.com	Prepetition Administrative Agent
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP	John Wm. Butler, John K. Lyons, Ron E. Meisler	333 W. Wacker Dr.	Suite 2100	Chicago	IL	60606	312-407-0700	312-407-0411	jbutler@skadden.com jlyonsch@skadden.com rmeisler@skadden.com	Counsel to the Debtor
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP	Kayalyn A. Marafioti, Thomas J. Matz	4 Times Square	P.O. Box 300	New York	NY	10036	212-735-3000	212-735-2000	kmarafio@skadden.com tmatz@skadden.com	Counsel to the Debtor
Spencer Fane Britt & Browne LLP	Daniel D. Doyle	1 North Brentwood Boulevard	Tenth Floor	St. Louis	MO	63105	314-863-7733	314-862-4656	ddoyle@spencerfane.com	Counsel for Movant Retirees and Proposed Counsel for The Official Committee of Retirees
Spencer Fane Britt & Browne LLP	Nicholas Franke	1 North Brentwood Boulevard	Tenth Floor	St. Louis	MO	63105	314-863-7733	314-862-4656	nfranke@spencerfane.com	Counsel for Movant Retirees and Proposed Counsel for The Official Committee of Retirees
Stevens & Lee, P.C.	Chester B. Salomon, Constantine D. Pourakis	485 Madison Avenue	20th Floor	New York	NY	10022	2123198500	2123198505	cp@stevenslee.com cs@stevenslee.com	Counsel for Wamco, Inc.
Togut, Segal & Segal LLP	Albert Togut	One Penn Plaza	Suite 3335	New York	NY	10119	212-594-5000	212-967-4258	altogut@teamtogut.com	Conflicts Counsel to the Debtors
United States Trustee	Alicia M. Leonard	33 Whitehall Street	21st Floor	New York	NY	10004-2112	212-510-0500	212-668-2255		United States Trustee
United States Trustee	Deirdre A. Martini	33 Whitehall Street	Suite 2100	New York	NY	10004	212-510-0500	212-668-2256	deirdre.martini@usdoj.gov	United States Trustee
Warner Stevens, L.L.P.	Michael D. Warner	1700 City Center Tower II	301 Commerce Street	Fort Worth	TX	76102	817-810-5250	817-810-5255		Proposed Conflicts Counsel for the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP	Jeffrey L. Tanenbaum, Esq.	767 Fifth Avenue		New York	NY	10153	212-310-8000	212-310-8007	jeffrey.tanenbaum@weil.com	Counsel to General Motors Corporation
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP	Martin J. Bienenstock, Esq.	767 Fifth Avenue		New York	NY	10153	212-310-8000	212-310-8007	martin.bienenstock@weil.com	Counsel to General Motors Corporation
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP	Michael P. Kessler, Esq.	767 Fifth Avenue		New York	NY	10153	212-310-8000	212-310-8007	michael.kessler@weil.com	Counsel to General Motors Corporation
Wilmington Trust Company	Steven M. Cimalore	Rodney Square North	1100 North Market Street	Wilmington	DE	19890	302-636-6058	302-636-4143	scimalore@wilmingtontrust.com	Creditor Committee Member/Indenture Trustee

COMPANY	CONTACT	ADDRESS1	ADDRESS2	CITY	STATE	ZIP	COUNTRY	PHONE	FAX	EMAIL	PARTY / FUNCTION
Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossman	Hannah E. Greenwald	1285 Avenue of the Americas		New York	NY	10019		212-554-1411	2125541444	hannah@blbglaw.com	Counsel for Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma; Public Employees's Retirement System of Mississippi; Raifeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenfornds ABP
Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossman	John P. Coffey	1285 Avenue of the Americas		New York	NY	10019		212-554-1409	2125541444	sean@blbglaw.com	Counsel for Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma; Public Employees's Retirement System of Mississippi; Raifeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenfornds ABP
Cohen, Weiss & Simon LLP	Joseph J. Vitale	330 West 42nd Street		New York	NY	10036		212-356-0238	646-473-8238	jvital@cwssny.com	Counsel for International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agriculture Implement Works of America (UAW)
Gorlick, Kravitz & Listhaus, P.C.	Barbara S. Mehlsack	17 State Street	4th Floor	New York	NY	10004		212-269-2500	212-269-2540	bmehlsack@qkllaw.com	Counsel for International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Unions No. 663; International Association of Machinists; AFL-CIO Tool and Die Makers Local Lodge 78, District 10; International Union of Operating Engineers Local Union Nos. 18, 101 and 832
Grant & Eisenhofer P.A.	Geoffrey C. Jarvis	1201 North Market Street	Suite 2100	Wilmington	DE	19801		302-622-7000	302-622-7100	gjarvis@ggelaw.com	Counsel for Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma; Public Employees's Retirement System of Mississippi; Raifeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenfornds ABP
Grant & Eisenhofer P.A.	Jay W. Eisenhofer	45 Rockefeller Center	650 Fifth Avenue	New York	NY	10111		212-755-6501	212-755-6503	jeisenhofer@gelaw.com	Counsel for Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma; Public Employees's Retirement System of Mississippi; Raifeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenfornds ABP
Grant & Eisenhofer P.A.	Sharan Nirmul	1201 North Market Street	Suite 2100	Wilmington	DE	19801		302-622-7000	302-622-7100	snirmul@gelaw.com	Counsel for Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma; Public Employees's Retirement System of Mississippi; Raifeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenfornds ABP
Gratz, Miller & Brueggeman, S.C.	Jill M. Hartley	1555 N. RiverCenter Drive	Suite 202	Milwaukee	WI	53212		414-271-4500	414-271-6308	jh@previant.com	Counsel for International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Unions No. 663; International Association of Machinists; AFL-CIO Tool and Die Makers Local Lodge 78, District 10
Gratz, Miller & Brueggeman, S.C.	Matthew R. Robbins	1555 N. RiverCenter Drive	Suite 202	Milwaukee	WI	53212		414-271-4500	414-271-6308	mrr@previant.com	Counsel for International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Unions No. 663; International Association of Machinists; AFL-CIO Tool and Die Makers Local Lodge 78, District 10

COMPANY	CONTACT	ADDRESS1	ADDRESS2	CITY	STATE	ZIP	COUNTRY	PHONE	FAX	EMAIL	PARTY / FUNCTION
Gratz, Miller & Brueggeman, S.C.	Timothy C. Hall	1555 N. RiverCenter Drive	Suite 202	Milwaukee	WI	53212		414-271-4500	414-271-6308	tch@previant.com	Counsel for International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Unions No. 663; International Association of Machinists; AFL-CIO Tool and Die Makers Local Lodge 78, District 10
International Union of Operating Engineers	Richard Griffin	1125-17th Avenue, N.W.		Washington	DC	20036		202-429-9100	202-778-2641	rgriffin@iuoe.org	Counsel for International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Unions No. 663; International Association of Machinists; AFL-CIO Tool and Die Makers Local Lodge 78, District 10; International Union of Operating Engineers Local Union Nos. 18, 101 and 832
Lowenstein Sandler PC	Ira M. Levee	1251 Avenue of the Americas	18th Floor	New York	NY	10020		212-262-6700	212-262-7402	ilevee@lowenstein.com	Counsel for Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma; Public Employes's Retirement System of Mississippi; Raifeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenforfs ABP
Lowenstein Sandler PC	Michael S. Etikin	1251 Avenue of the Americas	18th Floor	New York	NY	10020		212-262-6700	212-262-7402	metkin@lowenstein.com	Counsel for Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma; Public Employes's Retirement System of Mississippi; Raifeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenforfs ABP
Meyer, Suozzi, English & Klein, P.C.	Lowell Peterson, Esq.	1350 Broadway	Suite 501	New York	NY	10018		212-239-4999	212-239-1311	lpeterson@msek.com	Counsel to United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers, International Union (USW), AFL-CIO
Nix, Patterson & Roach, L.L.P.	Bradley E. Beckworth	205 Linda Drive		Daingerfield	TX	75638		903-645-7333	903-645-4415	bbeckworth@nixlawfirm.com	Counsel for Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma; Public Employes's Retirement System of Mississippi; Raifeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenforfs ABP
Nix, Patterson & Roach, L.L.P.	Jeffrey J. Angelovich	205 Linda Drive		Daingerfield	TX	75638		903-645-7333	903-645-4415	jangelovich@nixlawfirm.com	Counsel for Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma; Public Employes's Retirement System of Mississippi; Raifeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenforfs ABP
Nix, Patterson & Roach, L.L.P.	Susan Whatley	205 Linda Drive		Daingerfield	TX	75638		903-645-7333	903-645-4415	susanwhatley@nixlawfirm.com	Counsel for Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma; Public Employes's Retirement System of Mississippi; Raifeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenforfs ABP

COMPANY	CONTACT	ADDRESS1	ADDRESS2	CITY	STATE	ZIP	COUNTRY	PHONE	FAX	EMAIL	PARTY / FUNCTION
Schiffin & Barroway, LLP	Michael Yarnoff	280 King of Prussia Road		Radnor	PA	19087		610-667-7056	610-667-7706	myarnoff@sbclasslaw.com	Counsel for Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma; Public Employees's Retirement System of Mississippi; Raifeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenfonds ABP
Schiffin & Barroway, LLP	Sean M. Handler	280 King of Prussia Road		Radnor	PA	19087		610-667-7706	610-667-7056	shandler@sbclasslaw.com	Counsel for Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma; Public Employees's Retirement System of Mississippi; Raifeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenfonds ABP
United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers, International Union (USW), AFL-CIO	David Jury, Esq.	Five Gateway Center	Suite 807	Pittsburgh	PA	15222		412-562-2549	412-562-2429	djury@steelworkers-usw.org	Counsel to United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers, International Union (USW), AFL-CIO

EXHIBIT D

COMPANY	CONTACT	ADDRESS1	ADDRESS2	CITY	STATE	ZIP	COUNTRY	PHONE	FAX	EMAIL	PARTY / FUNCTION
Airgas, Inc.	David Boyle	259 Radnor-Chester Road, Suite 100	P.O. Box 6675	Radnor	PA	19087-8675		610-230-3064	310-687-1052	david.boyle@airgas.com	Counsel for Airgas, Inc.
Ajamie LLP	Thomas A. Ajamie	711 Louisiana	Suite 2150	Houston	TX	77002		713-860-1600	713-860-1699	tajamie@ajamie.com	Counsel for SANLUIS Rassini International, Inc.; Rassini, S.A. de C.V.
Ajamie LLP	Wallace A. Showman	1350 Avenue of the Americas	29th Floor	New York	NY	10019		212-246-6820	212-581-8958	wshowman@ajamie.com	Counsel for SANLUIS Rassini International, Inc.; Rassini, S.A. de C.V.
Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld, LLP	Peter J. Gurfein	2029 Centure Park East	Suite 2400	Los Angeles	CA	90067		310-552-6696	310-229-1001	pgurfein@akingump.com	Counsel for Wamco, Inc.
Allen Matkins Leck Gamble & Mallory LLP	Michael S. Greger	1900 Main Street	Fifth Floor	Irvine	CA	92614-7321		949-553-1313	949-553-8354	mgreger@allenmatkins.com	Counsel for Kilroy Realty, L.P.
Ambrake Corporation	Ronald L. Jones	300 Ring Road		Elizabethtown	KY	42701		270-765-0208	270-234-2395	rjones@ambrake.com	Representative for Ambrake Corporation
American Axle & Manufacturing, Inc.	Steven R. Keyes	One Dauch Drive, Mail Code 6E-2-42		Detroit	MI	48243		313-758-4868		steven.keyes@aam.com	Representative for American Axle & Manufacturing, Inc.
Andrews Kurth LLP	Gogi Malik	1717 Main Street	Suite 3700	Dallas	TX	75201		214-659-4400	214-659-4401	gogimalik@andrewskurth.com	Counsel for ITW Mortgage Investments IV, Inc.
Andrews Kurth LLP	Monica S. Blacker	1717 Main Street	Suite 3700	Dallas	TX	75201		214-659-4400	214-659-4401	mblacker@andrewskurth.com	Counsel for ITW Mortgage Investments IV, Inc.
Angelo, Gordon & Co.	Leigh Walzer	245 Park Avenue	26th Floor	New York	NY	10167		212-692-8251	212-867-6395	lwalzer@angelogordon.com	Counsel for Stanley Electric Sales of America, Inc.
Anglin, Flewelling, Rasmussen, Campbell & Trytten, LLP	Mark T. Flewelling	199 South Los Robles Avenue	Suite 600	Pasadena	CA	91101-2459		626-535-1900	626-577-7764	mtf@afrc.com	Counsel for Stanley Electric Sales of America, Inc.
APS Clearing, Inc.	Andy Leinhoff	1301 S. Capital of Texas Highway	Suite B-220	Austin	TX	78746		512-314-4416	512-314-4462	aleinoff@amph.com	Counsel for APS Clearing, Inc.
APS Clearing, Inc.	Matthew Hamilton	1301 S. Capital of Texas Highway	Suite B-220	Austin	TX	78746		512-314-4416	512-314-4462	mhamilton@amph.com	Counsel for APS Clearing, Inc.
Arent Fox PLLC	Mitchell D. Cohen	1675 Broadway		New York	NY	10019		212-484-3900	212-484-3990	Cohen.Mitchell@arentfox.com	Counsel for Pullman Bank and Trust Company
Arent Fox PLLC	Robert M. Hirsh	1675 Broadway		New York	NY	10019		212-484-3900	212-484-3990	Hirsh.Robert@arentfox.com	Counsel for Pullman Bank and Trust Company
Arnall Golden Gregory LLP	Darryl S. Laddin	171 17th Street NW	Suite 2100	Atlanta	GA	30363-1031		404-873-8120	404-873-8121	dladdin@agg.com	Counsel to Daishinku (America) Corp. d/b/a KDS America ("Daishinku"), SBC Telecommunications, Inc. (SBC)
Arnold & Porter LLP	Joel M. Gross	555 Twelfth Street, N.W.		Washington	D.C.	20004-1206		202-942-5000	202-942-5999	joel_gross@aporter.com	Counsel for CSX Transportation, Inc.
ATS Automation Tooling Systems Inc.	Carl Galloway	250 Royal Oak Road		Cambridge	Ontario	N3H 4R6	Canada	519-653-4483	519-650-6520	cgalloway@atsautomation.com	Company
Barack, Ferrazzano, Kirschbaum Perlman, & Nagelberg LLP	Kimberly J. Robinson	333 West Wacker Drive	Suite 2700	Chicago	IL	60606		312-629-5170	312-984-3150	kim.robinson@bfkpn.com	Counsel for Motion Industries, Inc.
Barack, Ferrazzano, Kirschbaum Perlman, & Nagelberg LLP	William J. Barrett	333 West Wacker Drive	Suite 2700	Chicago	IL	60606		312-629-5170	312-984-3150	william.barrett@bfkpn.com	Counsel for Motion Industries, Inc.
Barnes & Thornburg LLP	Alan K. Mills	11 S. Meridian Street		Indianapolis	IN	46204		317-236-1313	317-231-7433	alan.mills@btlaw.com	Counsel for Mays Chemical Company
Barnes & Thornburg LLP	John T. Gregg	300 Ottawa Avenue, NW	Suite 500	Grand Rapids	MI	49503		616-742-3930	626-742-3999	john.gregg@btlaw.com	Counsel to Priority Health
Barnes & Thornburg LLP	Patrick E. Mears	300 Ottawa Avenue, NW	Suite 500	Grand Rapids	MI	49503		616-742-3936	616-742-3999	pmears@btlaw.com	Counsel to Armada Rubber Manufacturing Company, Bank of America Leasing & Capital, LLC, & AutoCam Corporation
Barnes & Thornburg LLP	Michael K. McCrory Wendy D. Brewer	11 S. Meridian Street		Indianapolis	IN	46204		317-236-1313	317-231-7433	wendy.brewer@btlaw.com michael.mccrory@btlaw.com	Counsel for Gibbs Die Casting Corporation
Berry Moorman P.C.	James P. Murphy	535 Griswold	Suite 1900	Detroit	MI	48226		313-496-1200	313-496-1300	murph@berrymoorman.com	Counsel for Kamax L.P.; Optrex America, Inc.
Bialson, Bergen & Schwab	Kenneth T. Law, Esq.	2600 El Camino Real	Suite 300	Palo Alto	CA	94306		650-857-9500	650-494-2738	klaw@bbslaw.com	Counsel to UPS Supply Chain Solutions, Inc.
Bialson, Bergen & Schwab	Lawrence M. Schwab, Esq.	2600 El Camino Real	Suite 300	Palo Alto	CA	94306		650-857-9500	650-494-2738	lschwab@bbslaw.com	Counsel to UPS Supply Chain Solutions, Inc.; Solectron Corporation; Solectron De Mexico SA de CV; Solectron Invoitronics; Coherent, Inc.; Veritas Software Corporation
Bialson, Bergen & Schwab	Patrick M. Costello, Esq.	2600 El Camino Real	Suite 300	Palo Alto	CA	94306		650-857-9500	650-494-2738	pcostello@bbslaw.com	Solectron Corporation; Solectron de Mexico SA de CV; Solectron Invoitronics and Coherent, Inc.
Bialson, Bergen & Schwab	Thomas M. Gaa	2600 El Camino Real	Suite 300	Palo Alto	CA	94306		650-857-9500	650-494-2738	tgaa@bbslaw.com	Counsel to Veritas Software Corporation

COMPANY	CONTACT	ADDRESS1	ADDRESS2	CITY	STATE	ZIP	COUNTRY	PHONE	FAX	EMAIL	PARTY / FUNCTION
Blank Rome LLP	Bonnie Glantz Fatell	Chase Manhattan Centre	1201 Market Street, Suite 800	Wilmington	DE	19801		302-425-6423	302-428-5110	fatell@blankrome.com	Counsel for Special Devices, Inc.
Blank Rome LLP	Marc E. Richards	The Chrysler Building	405 Lexington Avenue	New York	NY	10174		212-885-5000	212-885-5002	mrichards@blankrome.com	Counsel for DENSO International America, Inc.
Bolhouse, Vander Hulst, Risko & Baar P.C.	David S. Lefere	3996 Chicago Drive SW		Grandville	MI	49418		616-531-7711	616-531-7757	davidl@bolhouselaw.com	Counsel for Eclipse Tool and Die, Inc.
Bond, Schoeneck & King, PLLC	Camille W. Hill	One Lincoln Center	18th Floor	Syracuse	NY	13202		315-218-8000	315-218-8100	chill@bsk.com	Counsel for Marquardt GmbH and Marquardt Switches, Inc.; Tessy Plastics Corp.
Bond, Schoeneck & King, PLLC	Charles J. Sullivan	One Lincoln Center	18th Floor	Syracuse	NY	13202		315-218-8000	315-218-8100	csullivan@bsk.com	Counsel for Diemolding Corporation
Bond, Schoeneck & King, PLLC	Stephen A. Donato	One Lincoln Center	18th Floor	Syracuse	NY	13202		315-218-8000	315-218-8100	sdonato@bsk.com	Counsel for Marquardt GmbH and Marquardt Switches, Inc.; Tessy Plastics Corp; Diemolding Corporation
Bose McKinney & Evans LLP	Jeannette Eisan Hinshaw	135 N. Pennsylvania Street	Suite 2700	Indianapolis	IN	46204		317-684-5296	317-684-5173	jhinshaw@boselaw.com	Counsel for Decatur Plastics Products, Inc. and Eikenberry & Associates, Inc.; Lorentson Manufacturing, Company, Inc.; Lorentson Tooling, Inc.; L & S Tools, Inc.; Hewitt Tool & Die, Inc.
Boult, Cummings, Conners & Berry, PLC	Austin L. McMullen	1600 Division Street, Suite 700	PO Box 34005	Nashville	TN	37203		615-252-2307	615-252-6307	amcmullen@bccb.com	Counsel for Calsonic Kansei North America, Inc.; Calsonic Harrison Co., Ltd.
Boult, Cummings, Conners & Berry, PLC	Roger G. Jones	1600 Division Street, Suite 700	PO Box 34005	Nashville	TN	37203		615-252-2307	615-252-6307	rgones@bccb.com	Counsel for Calsonic Kansei North America, Inc.; Calsonic Harrison Co., Ltd.
Brown & Connery, LLP	Donald K. Ludman	6 North Broad Street		Woodbury	NJ	08096		856-812-8900	856-853-9933	dludman@brownconnery.com	Counsel for SAP America, Inc.
Buchalter Nemer, A Profesional Corporation	Shawn M. Christianson	333 Market Street	25th Floor	San Francisco	CA	94105-2126		415-227-0900	415-227-0770	schristianson@buchalter.com	Counsel for Oracle USA, Inc.; Oracle Credit Corporation
Burr & Forman LLP	Michael Leo Hall	420 North Twentieth Street	Suite 3100	Birmingham	AL	35203		(205) 458-5367	(205) 244-5651	mhall@burr.com	Counsel to Mercedes-Benz U.S. International, Inc
Cage Williams & Abelman, P.C.	Steven E. Abelman	1433 Seventeenth Street		Denver	CO	80202		303-295-0202		sabelman@cagewilliams.com	Counsel for United Power, Inc.
Cahill Gordon & Reindel LLP	Jonathan Greenberg	80 Pine Street		New York	NY	10005		212-701-3000	732-205-6777	jonathan.greenberg@engelhard.com	Counsel to Engelhard Corporation
Cahill Gordon & Reindel LLP	Robert Usadi	80 Pine Street		New York	NY	10005		212-701-3000	212-269-5420	rusadi@cahill.com	Counsel to Engelhard Corporation
Calinoff & Katz, LLP	Dorothy H. Marinis-Riggio	140 East 45th Street	17th Floor	New York	NY	10017		212-826-8800	212-644-5123	driggio@candklaw.com	Counsel for Computer Patent Annuities Limited Partnership, Hydro Aluminum North America, Inc., Hydro Aluminum Adrian, Inc., Hydro Aluminum Precision Tubing NA, LLC, Hydro Aluminum Ellay Enfield Limited, Hydro Aluminum Rockledge, Inc., Norsk Hydro Canada, Inc., Emhart Technologies LLL and Adell Plastics, Inc.
Carson Fischer, P.L.C.	Robert A. Weisberg	300 East Maple Road	Third Floor	Birmingham	MI	48009-6317		248-644-4840	248-644-1832	rweisberg@carsonfischer.com	Counsel for Cascade Die Casting Group, Inc.
Carter Ledyard & Milburn LLP	Aaron R. Cahn	2 Wall Street		New York	NY	10005		212-732-3200	212-732-3233	cahn@clm.com	Counsel for STMicroelectronics, Inc.
Clark Hill PLC	Joel D. Applebaum	500 Woodward Avenue	Suite 3500	Detroit	MI	48226-3435		313-965-8300	313-965-8252	japplebaum@clarkhill.com	Counsel for BorgWarner Turbo Systems Inc.; Metaldyne Company, LLC
Clark Hill PLC	Seth A. Drucker	500 Woodward Avenue	Suite 3500	Detroit	MI	48226-3435		313-965-8300	313-965-8252	sdrucker@clarkhill.com	Counsel for BorgWarner Turbo Systems Inc.; Metaldyne Company, LLC
Clark Hill PLLC	Robert D. Gordon	500 Woodward Avenue	Suite 3500	Detroit	MI	48226-3435		313-965-8572	313-965-8252	rgordon@clarkhill.com	Counsel for ATS Automation Tooling Systems Inc.
Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP	Deborah M. Buell	One Liberty Plaza		New York	NY	10006		212-225-2000	212-225-3999	maofiling@cgsh.com	Counsel for Arneses Electricos Automotrices, S.A. de C.V.; Cordaflex, S.A. de C.V.

COMPANY	CONTACT	ADDRESS1	ADDRESS2	CITY	STATE	ZIP	COUNTRY	PHONE	FAX	EMAIL	PARTY / FUNCTION
Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton LLP	James L. Bromley	One Liberty Plaza		New York	NY	10006		212-225-2000	212-225-3999	maofiling@cgsh.com	Counsel for Bear, Stearns, Co. Inc.; Citigroup, Inc.; Credit Suisse First Boston; Deutsche Bank Securities, Inc.; Goldman Sachs Group, Inc.; JP Morgan Chase & Co.; Lehman Brothers, Inc.; Merrill Lynch & Co.; Morgan Stanley & Co., Inc.; UBS Securities, LLC
Cohen & Grigsby, P.C.	Thomas D. Maxson	11 Stanwix Street	15th Floor	Pittsburgh	PA	15222-1319		412-297-4706	412-209-1837	tmxson@cohenlaw.com	Counsel for Nova Chemicals, Inc.
Cohn Birnbaum & Shea P.C.	Scott D. Rosen, Esq.	100 Pearl Street, 12th Floor		Hartford	CT	06103		860-493-2200	860-727-0361	srosen@cb-shea.com	Counsel to Floyd Manufacturing Co., Inc.
Colbert & Winstead, P.C.	Amy Wood Malone	1812 Broadway		Nashville	TN	37203		615-321-0555	615-321-9555	amalone@colwinlaw.com	Counsel for Averitt Express, Inc.
Conlin, McKenney & Philbrick, P.C.	Bruce N. Elliott	350 South Main Street	Suite 400	Ann Arbor	MI	48104		734-971-9000	734-971-9001	Elliott@cmplaw.com	Counsel to Brazeway, Inc.
Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz LLP	Jeffrey C. Wisler, Esq.	1007 N. Orange Street	P.O. Box 2207	Wilmington	DE	19899		302-658-9141	302-658-0380	jwisler@cbih.com	Counsel to ORIX Warren, LLC
Contrarian Capital Management, L.L.C.	Mark Lee, Janice Stanton, Bill Raine, Seth Lax	411 West Putnam Avenue	Suite 225	Greenwich	CT	06830		203-862-8200	203-629-1977	mlee@contrariancapital.com jstanton@contrariancapital.com wrairie@contrariancapital.com solax@contrariancapital.com	Counsel to Contrarian Capital Management, L.L.C.
Coolidge, Wall, Womsley & Lombard Co. LPA	Sylvie J. Derrien	33 West First Street	Suite 600	Dayton	OH	45402		937-223-8177	937-223-6705	derrien@coolaw.com	Counsel for Harco Industries, Inc.; Harco Brake Systems, Inc.; Dayton Supply & Tool Company
Coolidge, Wall, Womsley & Lombard Co. LPA	Ronald S. Pretekin	33 West First Street	Suite 600	Dayton	OH	45402		937-223-8177	937-223-6705	Pretekin@coolaw.com	Counsel for Harco Industries, Inc.; Harco Brake Systems, Inc.; Dayton Supply & Tool Company
Coolidge, Wall, Womsley & Lombard Co. LPA	Steven M. Wachstein	33 West First Street	Suite 600	Dayton	OH	45402		937-223-8177	937-223-6705	wachstein@coolaw.com	Counsel for Harco Industries, Inc.; Harco Brake Systems, Inc.; Dayton Supply & Tool Company
Curtin & Heefner, LLP	Daniel P. Mazo	250 N. Pennsylvania Avenue		Morrisville	PA	19067		215-736-2521	215-736-3647	dpm@curtinheefner.com	Counsel for SPS Technologies, LLC; NSS Technologies, Inc.; SPS Technologies Waterford Company; Greer Stop Nut, Inc.
Curtin & Heefner, LLP	Robert Szwajkos	250 N. Pennsylvania Avenue		Morrisville	PA	19067		215-736-2521	215-736-3647	rsz@curtinheefner.com	Counsel for SPS Technologies, LLC; NSS Technologies, Inc.; SPS Technologies Waterford Company; Greer Stop Nut, Inc.
Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt & Mosle LLP	Andrew M. Thau	101 Park Avenue		New York	NY	10178-0061		212-696-8898	917-368-8898	athau@cm-p.com	Counsel for Flextronics International, Inc.; Flextronics International USA, Inc.; Multek Flexible Circuits, Inc.; Sheldahl de Mexico S.A.de C.V.; Northfield Acquisition Co.; Flextronics Asia-Pacific Ltd.; Flextronics Technology (M) Sdn. Bhd
Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt & Mosle LLP	David S. Karp	101 Park Avenue		New York	NY	10178-0061		212-696-6065	212-697-1559	dkarp@cm-p.com	Counsel for Flextronics International, Inc.; Flextronics International USA, Inc.; Multek Flexible Circuits, Inc.; Sheldahl de Mexico S.A.de C.V.; Northfield Acquisition Co.
Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt & Mosle LLP	Steven J. Reisman	101 Park Avenue		New York	NY	10178-0061		212-696-6065	212-697-1559	sreisman@cm-p.com	Counsel for Flextronics International, Inc.; Flextronics International USA, Inc.; Multek Flexible Circuits, Inc.; Sheldahl de Mexico S.A.de C.V.; Northfield Acquisition Co.; Flextronics Asia-Pacific Ltd.; Flextronics Technology (M) Sdn. Bhd

COMPANY	CONTACT	ADDRESS1	ADDRESS2	CITY	STATE	ZIP	COUNTRY	PHONE	FAX	EMAIL	PARTY / FUNCTION
DaimlerChrysler Corporation	Kim Kolb	CIMS 485-13-32	1000 Chrysler Drive	Auburn Hills	MI	48326-2766		248-576-5741		krk4@daimlerchrysler.com	Counsel for DaimlerChrysler Corporation; DaimlerChrysler Motors Company, LLC; DaimlerChrysler Canada, Inc.
Damon & Morey LLP	William F. Savino	1000 Cathedral Place	298 Main Street	Buffalo	NY	14202-4096		716-856-5500	716-856-5510	wsavino@damonmorey.com	Counsel for Relco, Inc.; The Durham Companies, Inc.
Daniels & Kaplan, P.C.	Jay Selanders	2405 Grand Boulevard	Suite 900	Kansas City	MO	64108-2519		816-221-3086	816-221-3006	selanders@danielsandkaplan.com	Counsel for DaimlerChrysler Corporation; DaimlerChrysler Motors Company, LLC; DaimlerChrysler Canada, Inc.
Denso International America, Inc.	Carol Sowa	24777 Denso Drive		Southfield	MI	48086		248-372-8531	248-350-7772	carol_sowa@denso-diam.com	Counsel to Denso International America, Inc.
DiConza Law, P.C.	Gerard DiConza, Esq.	630 Third Avenue, 7th Floor		New York	NY	10017		212-682-4940	212-682-4942	gdiConza@dLawpc.com	Counsel to Tyz-All Plastics, Inc.; Furukawa Electric North America APD
Dinsmore & Shohl LLP	John Persiani	1900 Chemed Center	255 East Fifth Street	Cincinnati	OH	45202		513-977-8200	513-977-8141	john.persiani@dinslaw.com	Counsel for The Procter & Gamble Company
DLA Piper Rudnick Gray Cary US LLP	Richard M. Kremen Maria Ellena Chavez-Ruark	The Marbury Building	6225 Smith Avenue	Baltimore	Maryland	21209-3600		410-580-3000	410-580-3001	richard.kremen@dlapiper.com	Counsel for Constellation NewEnergy, Inc. & Constellation NewEnergy - Gas Division, LLC
Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP	Andrew C. Kassner	18th and Cherry Streets		Philadelphia	PA	19103		215-988-2700	215-988-2757	andrew.kassner@db.com	Counsel to Penske Truck Leasing Co., L.P.
Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP	David B. Aaronson	18th and Cherry Streets		Philadelphia	PA	19103		215-988-2700	215-988-2757	david.aaronson@db.com	Counsel to Penske Truck Leasing Co., L.P. and Quaker Chemical Corporation
Duane Morris LLP	Margery N. Reed, Esq.	30 South 17th Street		Philadelphia	PA	19103-4196		215-979-1000	215-979-1020	dmdelphi@duanemorris.com	Counsel to ACE American Insurance Company
Duane Morris LLP	Joseph H. Lemkin	744 Broad Street	Suite 1200	Newark	NJ	07102		973-424-2000	973-424-2001	jhlemkin@duanemorris.com	Counsel for NDK America, Inc./NDK Crystal, Inc.; Foster Electric USA, Inc.; JST Corporation; Nichicon (America) Corporation; Taiho Corporation of America; American Aikoku Alpha, Inc.; Sagami America, Ltd.; SL America, Inc./SL Tennessee, LLC; Hosiden America Corporation and Samtech Corporation
Duane Morris LLP	Wendy M. Simkulak, Esq.	30 South 17th Street		Philadelphia	PA	19103-4196		215-979-1000	215-979-1020	wmsimkulak@duanemorris.com	Counsel to ACE American Insurance Company
Electronic Data Systems Corporation	Ayala Hassell	5400 Legacy Dr.	Mail Stop H3-3A-05	Plano	TX	75024		212-715-9100	212-715-8000	ayala.hassell@eds.com	Representative for Electronic Data Systems Corporation
Erman, Teicher, Miller, Zucker & Freedman, P.C.	David H. Freedman	400 Galleria Officentre	Ste. 444	Southfield	MI	48034		248-827-4100	248-827-4106	dfreedman@ermanteicher.com	Counsel for Doshi Prettl International, LLC
Erman, Teicher, Miller, Zucker & Freedman, P.C.	Earle I. Erman	400 Galleria Officentre	Ste. 444	Southfield	MI	48034		248-827-4100	248-827-4106	erman@ermanteicher.com	Counsel for Doshi Prettl International, LLC
Fagel Haber LLC	Gary E. Green	55 East Monroe	40th Floor	Chicago	IL	60603		312-346-7500	312-580-2201	ggreen@fagelhaber.com	Counsel for Aluminum International, Inc.
Fagel Haber LLC	Lauren Newman	55 East Monroe	40th Floor	Chicago	IL	60603		312-346-7500	312-580-2201	lnewman@fagelhaber.com	Counsel for Aluminum International, Inc.
Finkel Goldstein Rosenbloom & Nash LLP	Ted J. Donovan	26 Broadway	Suite 711	New York	NY	10004		212-344-2929	212-422-6836	tdonovan@finkgold.com	Counsel for Pillarhouse (U.S.A.) Inc.
Foley & Lardner LLP	Jill L. Murch	321 North Clark Street	Suite 2800	Chicago	IL	60610-4764		312-832-4500	312-832-4700	jmurch@foley.com	Counsel for Kuss Corporation
Fox Rothschild LLP	Fred Stevens	13 East 37th Street	Suite 800	New York	NY	10016		212-682-7575	212-682-4218	fstevens@foxrothschild.com	Counsel to M&Q Plastic Products, Inc.
Fox Rothschild LLP	Michael J. Viscount, Jr.	1301 Atlantic Avenue	Suite 400	Atlantic City	NJ	08401-7212		609-348-4515	609-348-6834	mviscount@foxrothschild.com	Counsel to M&Q Plastic Products, Inc.
Frederick T. Rikkers		419 Venture Court	P.O. Box 930555	Verona	WI	53593		608-848-6350	608-848-6357	fridders@rikkerslaw.com	Counsel for Southwest Metal Finishing, Inc.
Gazes LLC	Ian J. Gazes	32 Avenue of the Americas		New York	NY	10013		212-765-9000	212-765-9675	ian@gazesllc.com	Counsel to Setech, Inc.
Gazes LLC	Eric Wainer	32 Avenue of the Americas	Suite 1800	New York	NY	10013		212-765-9000	212-765-9675	office@gazesllc.com	Counsel to Setech, Inc.
Genovese Joblove & Battista, P.A.	Craig P. Rieders, Esq.	100 S.E. 2nd Street	Suite 4400	Miami	FL	33131		305-349-2300	305-349-2310	crieders@gjb-law.com	Counsel for Ryder Integrated Logistics, Inc.
Gibbons, Del Deo, Dolan, Griffinger & Vecchione	David N. Crapo	One Riverfront Plaza		Newark	NJ	07102-5497		973-596-4523	973-639-6244	dcrapo@gibbonslaw.com	Counsel for Epcos, Inc.
Goodwin Proctor LLP	Allan S. Brilliant	599 Lexington Avenue		New York	NY	10022		212-813-8800	212-355-3333	abrilliant@goodwinproctor.com	Counsel for UGS Corp.
Goodwin Proctor LLP	Craig P. Druehl	599 Lexington Avenue		New York	NY	10022		212-813-8800	212-355-3333	cdruehl@goodwinproctor.com	Counsel for UGS Corp.

COMPANY	CONTACT	ADDRESS1	ADDRESS2	CITY	STATE	ZIP	COUNTRY	PHONE	FAX	EMAIL	PARTY / FUNCTION
Goulston & Storrs, P.C.	Peter D. Bilowz	400 Atlantic Avenue		Boston	MA	02110-333		617-482-1776	617-574-4112	pbilowz@goulstonstorrs.com	Counsel to Thermotech Company
Graydon Head & Ritchey LLP	J. Michael Debblor, Susan M. Argo	1900 Fifth Third Center	511 Walnut Street	Cincinnati	OH	45202		513-621-6464	513-651-3836	mdebblor@graydon.com	Counsel for Grote Industries; Batesville Tool & Die; PIA Group; Reliable Castings
Greensfelder, Hemker & Gale, P.C.	Cherie Macdonald J. Patrick Bradley	10 S. Broadway	Suite 200	St. Louis	MO	63102		314-241-9090	314-241-8624	ckm@greensfelder.com jpb@greensfelder.com	Counsel for ARC Automotive, Inc.
Guaranty Bank	Herb Reiner	8333 Douglas Avenue		Dallas	TX	75225		214-360-2702	214-360-1940	herb.reiner@guarantygroup.com	Counsel for American Finance Group, Inc. d/b/a Guaranty Capital Corporation
Halperin Battaglia Raicht, LLP	Alan D. Halperin Christopher J. Battaglia	555 Madison Avenue	9th Floor	New York	NY	10022		212-765-9100	212-765-0964	cbattaglia@halperinlaw.net ahalperin@halperinlaw.net	Counsel to Pacific Gas Turbine Center, LLC and Chromalloy Gas Turbine Corporation
Harris D. Leinwand	Harris D. Leinwand	350 Fifth Avenue	Suite 2418	New York	NY	10118		212-725-7338	212-244-6219	hleinwand@aol.com	Counsel for Baker Hughes Incorporated; Baker Petrolite Corporation
Herrick, Feinstein LLP	Paul Rubin	2 Park Avenue		New York	NY	10016		212-592-1448	212-545-3360	prubin@herrick.com	Counsel for Canon U.S.A., Inc. and Schmidt Technology GmbH
Hewlett-Packard Company	Anne Marie Kennelly	3000 Hanover St., M/S 1050		Palo Alto	CA	94304		650-857-6902	650-852-8617	anne.kennelly@hp.com	Counsel to Hewlett-Packard Company
Hewlett-Packard Company	Glen Dumont	420 Mountain Avenue		Murray Hill	NJ	07974		908-898-4750	908-898-4137	glen.dumont@hp.com	Counsel for Hewlett-Packard Financial Services Company
Hewlett-Packard Company	Kenneth F. Higman	2125 E. Katella Avenue	Suite 400	Anaheim	CA	92806		714-940-7120	740-940-7539	ken.higman@hp.com	Counsel to Hewlett-Packard Company
Hewlett-Packard Company	Sharon Petrosino	420 Mountain Avenue		Murray Hill	NJ	07974		908-898-4760	908-898-4133	sharon.petrosino@hp.com	Counsel for Hewlett-Packard Financial Services Company
Hiscock & Barclay, LLP	J. Eric Charlton	300 South Salina Street	PO Box 4878	Syracuse	NY	13221-4878		315-425-2716	315-425-8576	echarlton@hiscockbarclay.com	Counsel for GW Plastics, Inc.
Hodgson Russ LLP	Cheryl R. Storie	One M&T Plaza	Suite 2000	Buffalo	NY	14203		716-848-1275	716-849-0349	cstorie@hodgsonruss.com	Counsel for Hexcel Corporation
Hodgson Russ LLP	Stephen H. Gross, Esq.	Carnegie Hall Tower	152 West 57th Street, 35th Street	New York	NY	10019		212-751-4300	212-751-0928	sgross@hodgsonruss.com	Counsel to Hexcel Corporation
Hogan & Hartson L.L.P.	Audrey Moog	Columbia Square	555 Thirteenth Street, N.W.	Washington	D.C.	20004-1109		202-637-5677	202-637-5910	amooq@hhlaw.com	Counsel for Umicore Autocat Canada Corp.
Hogan & Hartson L.L.P.	Edward C. Dolan	Columbia Square	555 Thirteenth Street, N.W.	Washington	D.C.	20004-1109		202-637-5677	202-637-5910	ecdolan@hhlaw.com	Counsel for Umicore Autocat Canada Corp.
Hogan & Hartson L.L.P.	Scott A. Golden	875 Third Avenue		New York	NY	10022		212-918-3000	212-918-3100	sagolden@hhlaw.com	Counsel for XM Satellite Radio Inc.
Holme Roberts & Owen, LLP	Elizabeth K. Flaagan	1700 Lincoln	Suite 4100	Denver	CO	80203		303-861-7000	303-866-0200	elizabeth.flaagan@hro.com	Counsel for CoorsTek, Inc.; Corus, L.P.
Honigman, Miller, Schwartz and Cohn, LLP	Donald T. Baty, Jr.	2290 First National Building	660 Woodward Avenue	Detroit	MI	48226		313-465-7314	313-465-7315	dbaty@honigman.com	Counsel for Fujitsu Ten Corporation of America
Honigman, Miller, Schwartz and Cohn, LLP	Robert B. Weiss, Frank L. Gorman	2290 First National Building	660 Woodward Avenue	Detroit	MI	48226-3583		313-465-7000	313-465-8000	rweiss@honigman.com fgorman@honigman.com	Counsel for General Motors Corporation
Hunter & Schank Co. LPA	John J. Hunter	One Canton Square	1700 Canton Avenue	Toledo	OH	43624		419-255-4300	419-255-9121	jrhunter@hunterschank.com	Counsel for ZF Group North America Operations, Inc.
Hunter & Schank Co. LPA	Thomas J. Schank	One Canton Square	1700 Canton Avenue	Toledo	OH	43624		419-255-4300	419-255-9121	tomschank@hunterschank.com	Counsel for ZF Group North America Operations, Inc.
Hunton & Williams LLP	Michael P. Massad, Jr.	Energy Plaza, 30th Floor	1601 Bryan Street	Dallas	TX	75201		214-979-3000	214-880-0011	mmassad@hunton.com	Counsel for RF Monolithics, Inc.
Hunton & Williams LLP	Steven T. Holmes	Energy Plaza, 30th Floor	1601 Bryan Street	Dallas	TX	75201		214-979-3000	214-880-0011	sholmes@hunton.com	Counsel for RF Monolithics, Inc.
Hurwitz & Fine P.C.	Ann E. Evanko	1300 Liberty Building		Buffalo	NY	14202		716-849-8900	716-855-0874	aee@hurwitzfine.com	Counsel for Jiffy-Tite Co., Inc.
Ice Miller	Ben T. Caughey	One American Square	Box 82001	Indianapolis	IN	46282-0200		317-236-2100	317-236-2219	Ben.Caughey@icemiller.com	Counsel for Sumco, Inc.
Infineon Technologies North America Corporation	Greg Bibbes	1730 North First Street	M/S 11305	San Jose	CA	95112		408-501-6442	408-501-2488	greg.bibbes@infineon.com	General Counsel & Vice President for Infineon Technologies North America Corporation
Infineon Technologies North America Corporation	Jeff Gillespie	2529 Commerce Drive	Suite H	Kokomo	IN	46902		765-454-2146	765-456-3836	jeffery.gillespie@infineon.com	Global Account Manager for Infineon Technologies North America
Jaffe, Raitt, Heuer & Weiss, P.C.	Paige E. Barr	27777 Franklin Road	Suite 2500	Southfield	MI	48034		248-351-3000	248-351-3082	pbarr@jaffelaw.com	Counsel for Trutron Corporation
Jenner & Block LLP	Ronald R. Peterson	One IBM Plaza		Chicago	IL	60611		312-222-9350	312-840-7381	rpeterson@jenner.com	Counsel for SPX Corporation (Contech Division), Alcan Rolled Products-Ravenswood, LLC and Tenneco Inc.
Jones Day	Scott J. Friedman	222 East 41st Street		New York	NY	10017		212-326-3939	212-755-7306	sjfriedman@jonesday.com	Counsel for WL. Ross & Co., LLC
Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP	John P. Sieger, Esq.	525 West Monroe Street		Chicago	IL	60661		312-902-5200	312-577-4733	john.sieger@kattenlaw.com	Counsel to TDK Corporation America and MEMC Electronic Materials, Inc.

COMPANY	CONTACT	ADDRESS1	ADDRESS2	CITY	STATE	ZIP	COUNTRY	PHONE	FAX	EMAIL	PARTY / FUNCTION
Kegler, Brown, Hill & Ritter Co., LPA	Kenneth R. Cookson	65 East State Street	Suite 1800	Columbus	OH	43215		614-426-5400	614-464-2634	kcookson@keglerbrown.com	Counsel for Solution Recovery Services
Kelley Drye & Warren, LLP	Mark I. Bane	101 Park Avenue		New York	NY	10178		212-808-7800	212-808-7897	mbane@kelleydrye.com	Counsel for the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation
Kelley Drye & Warren, LLP	Mark. R. Somerstein	101 Park Avenue		New York	NY	10178		212-808-7800	212-808-7897	msomerstein@kelleydrye.com	Counsel for the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation
Kennedy, Jennick & Murray	Larry Magarik	113 University Place	7th Floor	New York	NY	10003		212-358-1500	212-358-0207	lmagarik@kjmlabor.com	Counsel for The International Union of Electronic, Salaried, Machine and Furniture Workers - Communicaitons Workers of America
Kennedy, Jennick & Murray	Susan M. Jennik	113 University Place	7th Floor	New York	NY	10003		212-358-1500	212-358-0207	sjennik@kjmlabor.com	Counsel for The International Union of Electronic, Salaried, Machine and Furniture Workers - Communicaitons Workers of America
Kennedy, Jennick & Murray	Thomas Kennedy	113 University Place	7th Floor	New York	NY	10003		212-358-1500	212-358-0207	tkennedy@kjmlabor.com	Counsel for The International Union of Electronic, Salaried, Machine and Furniture Workers - Communicaitons Workers of America
King & Spalding, LLP	Alexandra B. Feldman	1185 Avenue of the Americas		New York	NY	10036		212-556-2100	212-556-2222	afeldman@kslaw.com	Counsel for Martinrea International, Inc.
King & Spalding, LLP	George B. South, III	1185 Avenue of the Americas		New York	NY	10036		212-556-2100	212-556-2222	gsouth@kslaw.com	Counsel for Martinrea International, Inc.
Kirkland & Ellis LLP	Geoffrey A. Richards	200 East Randolph Drive		Chicago	IL	60601		312-861-2000	312-861-2200	grichards@kirkland.com	Counsel for Lunt Manufacturing Company
Kirkpatrick & Lockhart Nicholson Graham LLP	Edward M. Fox	599 Lexington Avenue		New York	NY	10022		212-536-4812	212-536-3901	efox@king.com	Counsel to Wilmington Trust Company, as Indenture trustee
Krugliak, Wilkins, Griffiths & Dougherty CO., L.P.A.	Sam O. Simmerman	4775 Munson Street N.W.	P.O. Box 36963	Canton	OH	44735-6963		330-497-0700	330-497-4020	sosimmerman@kwgd.com	Counsel to for Millwood, Inc.
Kutchin & Rufo, P.C.	Edward D. Kutchin	155 Federal Street	17th Floor	Boston	MA	02110-1727		617-542-3000	617-542-3001	ekutchin@kutchinrufo.com	Counsel for Parlex Corporation
Lambert. Leser, Isackson, Cook & Guinta, P.C.	Susan M. Cook	309 Davidson Building	PO Box 835	Bay City	MI	48707-0835		989-893-3518		smcook@lambertleser.com	Counsel for Linamar Corporation
Latham & Watkins	Erika Ruiz	885 Third Avenue		New York	NY	10022		212-906-1200	212-751-4864	erika.ruiz@lw.com	UCC Professional
Latham & Watkins	Henry P. Baer, Jr.	885 Third Avenue		New York	NY	10022		212-906-1200	212-751-4864	henry.baer@lw.com	UCC Professional
Latham & Watkins	John W. Weiss	885 Third Avenue		New York	NY	10022		212-906-1200	212-751-4864	john.weiss@lw.com	UCC Professional
Latham & Watkins	Mark A. Broude	885 Third Avenue		New York	NY	10022		212-906-1384	212-751-4864	mark.broude@lw.com	UCC Professional
Latham & Watkins	Michael J. Riela	885 Third Avenue		New York	NY	10022		212-906-1200	212-751-4864	michael.riela@lw.com	UCC Professional
Latham & Watkins	Mitchell A. Seider	885 Third Avenue		New York	NY	10022		212-906-1200	212-751-4864	mitcheil.seider@lw.com	UCC Professional
Latham & Watkins	Robert Rosenberg	885 Third Avenue	Suite 1000	New York	NY	10022-4834		212-906-1370	212-751-4864	robert.rosenberg@lw.com	UCC Professional
Lewis and Roca LLP	Rob Charles, Esq.	One South Church Street	Suite 700	Tucson	AZ	85701		520-629-4427	520-879-4705	rcharles@lrlaw.com	Counsel to Freescale Semiconductor, Inc. f/k/a Motorola Semiconductor Systems (U.S.A.) Inc.
Lewis and Roca LLP	Susan M. Freeman, Esq.	40 North Central Avenue	Suite 1900	Phoenix	AZ	85004-4429		602-262-5756	602-734-3824	sfreeman@lrlaw.com	Counsel to Freescale Semiconductor, Inc. f/k/a Motorola Semiconductor Systems (U.S.A.) Inc.
Linear Technology Corporation	John England, Esq.	1630 McCarthy Blvd.		Milpitas	CA	95035-7417		408-432-1900	408-434-0507	jengland@linear.com	Counsel to Linear Technology Corporation
Linebarger Goggan Blair & Sampson, LLP	Diane W. Sanders	1949 South IH 35 (78741)	P.O. Box 17428	Austin	TX	78760-7428		512-447-6675	512-443-5114	austin.bankruptcy@publicans.com	Counsel to Cameron County, Brownsville ISD
Linebarger Goggan Blair & Sampson, LLP	Elizabeth Weller	2323 Bryan Street	Suite 1600	Dallas	TX	75201		214-880-0089	4692215002	dallas.bankruptcy@publicans.com	Counsel for Dallas County and Tarrant County
Linebarger Goggan Blair & Sampson, LLP	John P. Dillman	P.O. Box 3064		Houston	TX	77253-3064		713-844-3478	713-844-3503	houston_bankruptcy@publicans.com	Counsel in Charge for Taxing Authorities
Loeb & Loeb LLP	William M. Hawkins	345 Park Avenue		New York	NY	10154		212-407-4000	212-407-4990	whawkins@loeb.com	Counsel for Industrial Ceramics Corporation
Lowenstein Sandler PC	Bruce S. Nathan	1251 Avenue of the Americas		New York	NY	10020		212-262-6700	212-262-7402	bnathan@lowenstein.com	Counsel for Daewoo International (America) Corp.
Lowenstein Sandler PC	Kenneth A. Rosen	65 Livingston Avenue		Roseland	NJ	07068		973-597-2500	973-597-2400	krosen@lowenstein.com	Counsel for Cerberus Capital Management, L.P.
Lowenstein Sandler PC	Scott Cargill	65 Livingston Avenue		Roseland	NJ	07068		973-597-2500	973-597-2400	scargill@lowenstein.com	Counsel for Cerberus Capital Management, L.P.; AT&T Corporation
Lowenstein Sandler PC	Vincent A. D'Agostino	65 Livingston Avenue		Roseland	NJ	07068		973-597-2500	973-597-2400	vdagostino@lowenstein.com	Counsel for AT&T Corporation

COMPANY	CONTACT	ADDRESS1	ADDRESS2	CITY	STATE	ZIP	COUNTRY	PHONE	FAX	EMAIL	PARTY / FUNCTION
MacDonald, Illig, Jones & Britton LLP	Richard J. Parks	100 State Street	Suite 700	Erie	PA	16507-1459		814-870-7754	814-454-4647	rparks@mjb.com	Counsel for Ideal Tool Company, Inc.
Madison Capital Management	Joe Landen	6143 South Willow Drive	Suite 200	Greenwood Village	CO	80111		303-957-4254	303-957-2098	jlanden@madisoncap.com	Representative for Madison Capital Management
Margulies & Levinson, LLP	Jeffrey M. Levinson, Esq. Leah M. Caplan, Esq.	30100 Chagrin Boulevard	Suite 250	Pepper Pike	OH	44124		216-514-4935	216-514-4936	jml@ml-legal.com lmc@ml-legal.com	Counsel for Venture Plastics
Masuda Funai Eifert & Mitchell, Ltd.	Gary D. Santella	203 North LaSalle Street	Suite 2500	Chicago	IL	60601-1262		312-245-7500	312-245-7467	gsantella@masudafunai.com	Counsel for NDK America, Inc./NDK Crystal, Inc.; Foster Electric USA, Inc.; JST Corporation; Nichicon (America) Corporation; Taiho Corporation of America; American Aikoku Alpha, Inc.; Sagami America, Ltd.; SL America, Inc./SL Tennessee, LLC; Hosiden America Corporation and Samtech Corporation
Mayer, Brown, Rowe & Maw LLP	Jeffrey G. Tougas	1675 Broadway		New York	NY	10019		212-262-1910	212-506-2500	jgtougas@mayerbrownrowe.com	Counsel for Bank of America, N.A.
Mayer, Brown, Rowe & Maw LLP	Raniero D'Aversa, Jr.	1675 Broadway		New York	NY	10019		212-262-1910	212-506-2500	rdaversa@mayerbrownrowe.com	Counsel for Bank of America, N.A.
McCarter & English, LLP	David J. Adler, Jr. Esq.	245 Park Avenue, 27th Floor		New York	NY	10167		212-609-6800	212-609-6921	dadler@mccarter.com	Counsel to Ward Products, LLC
McDermott Will & Emery LLP	James M. Sullivan	50 Rockefeller Plaza		New York	NY	10020		212-547-5400	212-547-5444	jmsullivan@mwe.com	Counsel to Linear Technology Corporation, National Semiconductor Corporation; Timken Corporation
McDermott Will & Emery LLP	Stephen B. Selbst	50 Rockefeller Plaza		New York	NY	10020		212-547-5400	212-547-5444	sselbst@mwe.com	Counsel for National Semiconductor Corporation
McDonald Hopkins Co., LPA	Jean R. Robertson, Esq.	600 Superior Avenue, East	Suite 2100	Cleveland	OH	44114		216-348-5400	216-348-5474	jrobertson@mcdonaldhopkins.com	Counsel to Brush Engineered materials
McDonald Hopkins Co., LPA	Scott N. Opincar, Esq.	600 Superior Avenue, E.	Suite 2100	Cleveland	OH	44114		216-348-5400	216-348-5474	sopincar@mcdonaldhopkins.com	Counsel to Republic Engineered Products, Inc.
McDonald Hopkins Co., LPA	Shawn M. Riley, Esq.	600 Superior Avenue, E.	Suite 2100	Cleveland	OH	44114		216-348-5400	216-348-5474	sriley@mcdonaldhopkins.com	Counsel to Republic Engineered Products, Inc.
McElroy, Deutsch, Mulvaney & Carpenter, LLP	Jeffrey Bernstein, Esq.	Three Gateway Center	100 Mulberry Street	Newark	NJ	07102-4079		973-622-7711	973-622-5314	jbernstein@mdmc-law.com	Counsel to New Jersey Self-Insurers Guaranty Association
McGuirewoods LLP	Elizabeth L. Gunn	One James Center	901 East Cary Street	Richmond	VA	23219-4030		804-775-1178	804-698-2186	egunn@mcguirewoods.com	Counsel for Siemens Logistics Assembly Systems, Inc.
Meyer, Suozzi, English & Klein, P.C.	Hanan Kolko	1350 Broadway	Suite 501	New York	NY	10018		212-239-4999	212-239-1311	hkolko@msek.com	Counsel for The International Union of Electronic, Salaried, Machine and Furniture Workers - Communications Workers of America
Meyers, Rodbell & Rosenbaum, P.A.	M. Evan Meyers	Berkshire Building	6801 Kenilworth Avenue, Suite 400	Riverdale Park	MD	20737-1385		301-699-5800		emeyers@mrlaw.net	Counsel for Prince George County, Maryland
Meyers, Rodbell & Rosenbaum, P.A.	Robert H. Rosenbaum	Berkshire Building	6801 Kenilworth Avenue, Suite 400	Riverdale Park	MD	20737-1385		301-699-5800		rosenbaum@mrlaw.net	Counsel for Prince George County, Maryland
Miles & Stockbridge, P.C.	Kerry Hopkins	10 Light Street		Baltimore	MD	21202		410-385-3418	410-385-3700	khopkins@milesstockbridge.com	Counsel for Computer Patent Annuities Limited Partnership, Hydro Aluminum North America, Inc., Hydro Aluminum Adrian, Inc., Hydro Aluminum Precision Tubing NA, LLC, Hydro Aluminum Ellay Enfield Limited, Hydro Aluminum Rockledge, Inc., Norsk Hydro Canada, Inc., Emhart Technologies LLL and Adell Plastics, Inc.

COMPANY	CONTACT	ADDRESS1	ADDRESS2	CITY	STATE	ZIP	COUNTRY	PHONE	FAX	EMAIL	PARTY / FUNCTION
Miles & Stockbridge, P.C.	Thomas D. Renda	10 Light Street		Baltimore	MD	21202		410-385-3418	410-385-3700	trenda@milesstockbridge.com	Counsel for Computer Patent Annuities Limited Partnership, Hydro Aluminum North America, Inc., Hydro Aluminum Adrian, Inc., Hydro Aluminum Precision Tubing NA, LLC, Hydro Aluminum Ellay Enfield Limited, Hydro Aluminum Rockledge, Inc., Norsk Hydro Canada, Inc., Emhart Technologies LLL and Adell Plastics, Inc.
Miller Johnson	Thomas P. Sarb Robert D. Wolford	250 Monroe Avenue, N.W.	Suite 800, PO Box 306	Grand Rapids	MI	49501-0306		616-831-1748 616-831-1726	616-988-1748 616-988-1726	sarbt@millerjohnson.com wolfordr@millerjohnson.com	Counsel to Pridgeon & Clay, Inc.
Miller, Canfield, Paddock and Stone, P.L.C.	Timothy A. Fusco	150 W. Jefferson Avenue	Suite 2500	Detroit	MI	48226		313-496-8435	313-496-8453	fuscot@millerjohnson.com	Counsel for Niles USA Inc.; Techcentral, LLC; The Bartech Group, Inc.; Fischer Automotive Systems
Miller, Canfield, Paddock and Stone, P.L.C.	Jonathan S. Green	150 W. Jefferson Avenue	Suite 2500	Detroit	MI	48226		313-496-8452	313-496-7997	greenj@millerjohnson.com	Counsel for Wells Operating Partnership, LP
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris Glovsky and Pepco, P.C.	Michael L. Schein	666 Third Avenue		New York	NY	10017		212-935-3000	212-983-3115	mischein@mintz.com	Counsel to Hitachi Automotive Products (USA), Inc.; Conceria Pasubio
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris Glovsky and Pepco, P.C.	Paul J. Ricotta	One Financial Center		Boston	MA	02111		617-542-6000	617-542-2241	pjricotta@mintz.com	Counsel for Hitachi Automotive Products (USA), Inc.
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris Glovsky and Pepco, P.C.	Stephanie K. Hoos	The Chrysler Center	666 Third Avenue	New York	NY	10017		212-935-3000	212-983-3115	skhoos@mintz.com	Counsel for Hitachi Automotive Products (USA), Inc.
Molex Connector Corp	Jeff Ott	2222 Wellington Ct.		Lisle	IL	60532		630-527-4254	630-512-8610	Jeff.Ott@molex.com	Counsel for Molex Connector Corp
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP	Andrew D. Gottfried	101 Park Avenue		New York	NY	10178-0060		212-309-6000	212-309-6001	agottfried@morganlewis.com	Counsel for ITT Industries, Inc.; Hitachi Chemical (Singapore), Ltd.
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP	Menachem O. Zelmanovitz	101 Park Avenue		New York	NY	10178		212-309-6000	212-309-6001	mzelmanovitz@morganlewis.com	Counsel for Hitachi Chemical (Singapore) Pte, Ltd.
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP	Richard W. Esterkin, Esq.	300 South Grand Avenue		Los Angeles	CA	90017		213-612-1163	213-612-2501	resterkin@morganlewis.com	Counsel to Sumitomo Corporation
Moritt Hock Hamroff & Horowitz LLP	Leslie Ann Berkoff	400 Garden City Plaza		Garden City	NY	11530		516-873-2000		lberkoff@moritthock.com	Counsel for Standard Microsystems Corporation and its direct and indirect subsidiaries Oasis SiliconSystems AG and SMSC NA Automotive, LLC (successor-in-interest to Oasis Silicon Systems, Inc.)
Morris, Nichols, Arsht and Tunnell	Michael G. Busenkell	PO Box 1347		Wilmington	DE	19899-1347		302-658-9200	302-658-3989	mbusenkel@mnat.com	Counsel for Chicago Miniature Optoelectronic Technologies, Inc.
Morris, Nichols, Arsht and Tunnell	Robert J. Dehney	PO Box 1347		Wilmington	DE	19899-1347		302-658-9200	302-658-3989	rdehney@mnat.com	Counsel for Chicago Miniature Optoelectronic Technologies, Inc.
Morrison Cohen LLP	Joseph T. Moldovan Michael R. Dal Lago	909 Third Avenue		New York	NY	10022		212-735-8603 212-735-8757	917-522-3103 917-522-3157	jmoldovan@morrisoncohen.com mdallago@morrisoncohen.com	Counsel to Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Michigan
Munsch Hardt Kopf & Harr, P.C.	Raymond J. Urbanik, Esq., Joseph J. Wielebinski, Esq. and Davor Rukavina, Esq.	4000 Fountain Place	1445 Ross Avenue	Dallas	RX	75202-2790		214-855-7590 214-855-7561 214-855-7587	214-978-4374	rurbanik@munsch.com jwielebinski@munsch.com drukavina@munsch.com	Counsel for Texas Instruments Incorporated
Nantz, Litowich, Smith, Girard & Hamilton, P.C.	Sandra S. Hamilton	2025 East Beltline, S.E.	Suite 600	Grand Rapids	MI	49546		616-977-0077	616-977-0529	sandy@nlsq.com	Counsel for Lanfker Diversified Industries, Inc.

COMPANY	CONTACT	ADDRESS1	ADDRESS2	CITY	STATE	ZIP	COUNTRY	PHONE	FAX	EMAIL	PARTY / FUNCTION
Nathan, Neuman & Nathan, P.C.	Kenneth A. Nathan	29100 Northwestern Highway	Suite 260	Southfield	MI	48034		248-351-0099	248-351-0487	Knathan@nathanneuman.com	Counsel for 975 Opdyke LP; 1401 Troy Associates Limited Partnership; 1401 Troy Associates Limited Partnership c/o Etkin Equities, Inc.; 1401 Troy Associates LP; Brighton Limited Partnership; DPS Information Services, Inc.; Etkin Management Services, Inc. and Etkin Real Properties
Nathan, Neuman & Nathan, P.C.	Susanna C. Brennan	29100 Northwestern Highway	Suite 260	Southfield	MI	48034		248-351-0099	248-351-0487	sbrennan@nathanneuman.com	Counsel for 975 Opdyke LP; 1401 Troy Associates Limited Partnership; 1401 Troy Associates Limited Partnership c/o Etkin Equities, Inc.; 1401 Troy Associates LP; Brighton Limited Partnership; DPS Information Services, Inc.; Etkin Management Services, Inc. and Etkin Real Properties
National City Commercial Capital	Lisa M. Moore	995 Dalton Avenue		Cincinnati	OH	45203		513-455-2390	866-298-4481	lisa.moore2@nationalcity.com	Vice President and Senior Counsel for National City Commercial Capital
Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough	George B. Cauthen	1320 Main Street, 17th Floor	PO Box 11070	Columbia	SC	29201		803-7255-9425	803-256-7500	george.cauthen@nelsonmullins.com	Counsel for Datwyler Rubber & Plastics, Inc.; Datwyler, Inc.; Datwyler i/o devices (Americas), Inc.; Rothrist Tube (USA), Inc.
Noma Company and General Chemical Performance Products LLC	James Imbriaco	90 East Halsey Road		Parsippany	NJ	07054		973-884-6952	973-515-3244	jimbriaco@gentek-global.com	
Norris, McLaughlin & Marcus	Elizabeth L. Abdelmasieh, Esq	721 Route 202-206	P.O. Box 1018	Somerville	NJ	08876		908-722-0700	908-722-0755	eabdelmasieh@nmmlaw.com	Counsel for Rotor Clip Company, Inc.
North Point	David G. Heiman	901 Lakeside Avenue		Cleveland	OH	44114		216-586-3939	216-579-0212	dgheiman@jonesday.com	Counsel for WL. Ross & Co., LLC
North Point	Michelle M. Harner	901 Lakeside Avenue		Cleveland	OH	44114		216-586-3939	216-579-0212	mmharner@jonesday.com	Counsel for WL. Ross & Co., LLC
Office of the Texas Attorney General	Jay W. Hurst	P.O. Box 12548		Austin	TX	78711-2548		512-475-4861	512-482-8341	jay.hurst@oag.state.tx.us	Counsel for The Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts Company
Orbotech, Inc.	Michael M. Zizza, Legal Manager	44 Manning Road		Billerica	MA	01821		978-901-5025	978-667-9969	michaelz@orbotech.com	
Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP	Alyssa Englund, Esq.	666 Fifth Avenue		New York	NY	10103		212-506-5187	212-506-5151	aenglund@orrick.com	Counsel to America President Lines, Ltd. And APL Co. Pte Ltd.
Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP	Frederick D. Holden, Jr., Esq.	405 Howard Street		San Francisco	CA	94105		415-773-5700	415-773-5759	fholden@orrick.com	Counsel to America President Lines, Ltd. And APL Co. Pte Ltd.
Otterbourg, Steindler, Houston & Rosen, P.C.	Melissa A. Hager	230 Park Avenue		New York	NY	10169		212-661-9100	212-682-6104	mhager@oshr.com	Counsel for Sharp Electronics Corporation
Otterbourg, Steindler, Houston & Rosen, P.C.	Scott L. Hazan	230 Park Avenue		New York	NY	10169		212-661-9100	212-682-6104	shazan@oshr.com	Counsel for Sharp Electronics Corporation
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison	Curtis J. Weidler	1285 Avenue of the Americas		New York	NY	10019-6064		212-373-3157	212-373-2053	cweidler@paulweiss.com	Counsel for Ambrake Corporation; Akebono Corporation
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison	Douglas R. Davis	1285 Avenue of the Americas		New York	NY	10019-6064		212-373-3000	212-757-3990	ddavis@paulweiss.com	Counsel for Noma Company and General Chemical Performance Products LLC
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison	Elizabeth R. McColm	1285 Avenue of the Americas		New York	NY	10019-6064		212-373-3000	212-757-3990	emccolm@paulweiss.com	Counsel for Noma Company and General Chemical Performance Products LLC
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison	Stephen J. Shimshak	1285 Avenue of the Americas		New York	NY	10019-6064		212-373-3133	212-373-2136	sshimshak@paulweiss.com	Counsel for Ambrake Corporation
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation	Ralph L. Landy	1200 K. Street, N.W.		Washington	DC	20005-4026		202-326-4020	202-326-4112	landy.ralph@pbgc.gov	Counsel to Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation
Pepe & Hazard LLP	Charles J. Filardi, Jr., Esq.	30 Jelliff Lane		Southport	CT	06890		203-319-4042	203-319-4034	cfilardi@pepehazard.com	Federal Express Corporation

COMPANY	CONTACT	ADDRESS1	ADDRESS2	CITY	STATE	ZIP	COUNTRY	PHONE	FAX	EMAIL	PARTY / FUNCTION
Pepper, Hamilton LLP	Anne Marie Aaronson	3000 Two logan Square	Eighteenth & Arch Streets	Philadelphia	PA	19103-2799		215-981-4000	215-981-4750	aaronsona@pepperlaw.com	Counsel for Capro, Ltd, Teleflex Automotive Manufacturing Corporation and Teleflex Incorporated d/b/a Teleflex Morse (Capro)
Pepper, Hamilton LLP	Linda J. Casey	3000 Two logan Square	Eighteenth & Arch Streets	Philadelphia	PA	19103-2799		215-981-4000	215-981-4750	caseyl@pepperlaw.com	Counsel for SKF USA, Inc.
Pepper, Hamilton LLP	Henry Jaffe	1313 Market Street	PO Box 1709	Wilmington	DE	19899-1709		302-777-6500	302-421-8390	jaffeh@pepperlaw.com	Counsel for SKF USA, Inc.
Pepper, Hamilton LLP	Francis J. Lawall	3000 Two logan Square	Eighteenth & Arch Streets	Philadelphia	PA	19103-2799		215-981-4000	215-981-4750	lawallf@pepperlaw.com	Counsel for Capro, Ltd, Teleflex Automotive Manufacturing Corporation and Teleflex Incorporated d/b/a Teleflex Morse (Capro)
Phillips Nizer LLP	Sandra A. Riemer, Esq.	666 Fifth Avenue		New York	NY	10103		212-841-0589	212-262-5152	sriemer@phillipsnizer.com	Counsel to Freescale Semiconductor, Inc. f/k/a Motorola Semiconductor Systems (U.S.A.) Inc.
Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP	Karen B. Dine	1540 Broadway		New York	NY	10036-4039		212-858-1000	212-858-1500	karen.dine@pillsburylaw.com	Counsel for Clarion Corporation of America
Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP	Margot P. Erlich	1540 Broadway		New York	NY	10036-4039		212-858-1000	212-858-1500	margot.erlich@pillsburylaw.com	Counsel for MeadWestvaco Corporation, MeadWestvaco South Carolina LLC and MeadWestvaco Virginia Corporation
Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP	Mark D. Houle	650 Town Center Drive	7th Floor	Costa Mesa	CA	92626-7122		714-436-6800	714-436-2800	mark.houle@pillsburylaw.com	Counsel for Clarion Corporation of America
Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP	Richard L. Epling	1540 Broadway		New York	NY	10036-4039		212-858-1000	212-858-1500	richard.epling@pillsburylaw.com	Counsel for MeadWestvaco Corporation, MeadWestvaco South Carolina LLC and MeadWestvaco Virginia Corporation
Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP	Robin L. Spear	1540 Broadway		New York	NY	10036-4039		212-858-1000	212-858-1500	robin.spear@pillsburylaw.com	Counsel for MeadWestvaco Corporation, MeadWestvaco South Carolina LLC and MeadWestvaco Virginia Corporation
Pitney Hardin LLP	Ronald S. Beacher	7 Times Square		New York	NY	10036		212-297-5800	212-682-3485	rbeacher@pitneyhardin.com	Counsel for IBJTC Business Credit Corporation
Pitney Hardin LLP	Richard M. Meth	P.O. Box 1945		Morristown	NJ	07962-1945		973-966-6300	973-966-1015	rmeth@pitneyhardin.com	Counsel for Marshall E. Campbell Company
Porzio, Bromberg & Newman, P.C.	Brett S. Moore, Esq.	100 Southgate Parkway	P.O. Box 1997	Morristown	NJ	07960		973-538-4006	973-538-5146	bsmoore@pbnlaw.com	Counsel to Neuman Aluminum Automotive, Inc. and Neuman Aluminum Impact Extrusion, Inc.
Porzio, Bromberg & Newman, P.C.	John S. Mairo, Esq.	100 Southgate Parkway	P.O. Box 1997	Morristown	NJ	07960		973-538-4006	973-538-5146	jsmairo@pbnlaw.com	Counsel to Neuman Aluminum Automotive, Inc. and Neuman Aluminum Impact Extrusion, Inc.
Pryor & Mandelup, LLP	A. Scott Mandelup, Kenneth A. Reynolds	675 Old Country Road		Westbury	NY	11590		516-997-0999	516-333-7333	asm@pryormandelup.com kar@pryormandelup.com	Counsel for National Molding Corporation; Security Plastics Division/NMC LLC
QAD, Inc.	Jason Pickering, Esq.	10,000 Midlantic Drive		Mt. Laurel	NJ	08054		856-840-2489	856-840-2740	jkp@qad.com	Counsel to QAD, Inc.
Quadrangle Debt Recovery Advisors LLC	Andrew Herenstein	375 Park Avenue, 14th Floor		New York	NY	10152		212-418-1742	866-741-2505	andrew.herenstein@quadrangle.com	Counsel to Quadrangle Debt Recovery Advisors LLC
Quadrangle Group LLC	Patrick Bartels	375 Park Avenue, 14th Floor		New York	NY	10152		212-418-1748	866-552-2052	patrick.bartels@quadranglegroup.com	Counsel to Quadrangle Group LLC
Quarles & Brady Streich Lang LLP	John A. Harris	Renaissance One	Two North Central Avenue	Phoenix	AZ	85004-2391		602-229-5200	602-229-5690	jharris@quarles.com	Counsel for Semiconductor Components Industries, Inc.
Quarles & Brady Streich Lang LLP	Kasey C. Nye	One South Church Street		Tucson	AZ	85701		520-770-8717	520-770-2203	knve@quarles.com	Counsel for Offshore International, Inc.; Maquilas Teta Kawi, S.A. de C.V.; On Semiconductor Corporation
Quarles & Brady Streich Lang LLP	Scott R. Goldberg	Renaissance One	Two North Central Avenue	Phoenix	AZ	85004-2391		602-229-5200	602-229-5690	sgoldber@quarles.com	Counsel for Semiconductor Components Industries, Inc.
Reed Smith	Elena Lazarou	599 Lexington Avenue	29th Street	New York	NY	10022		212-521-5400	212-521-5450	elazarou@reedsmith.com	Counsel for General Electric Capital Corporation, Strategic Asset Finance.
Republic Engineered Products, Inc.	Joseph Lapinsky	3770 Embassy Parkway		Akron	OH	44333		330-670-3004	330-670-3020	jlapinsky@republicengineered.com	Counsel to Republic Engineered Products, Inc.

COMPANY	CONTACT	ADDRESS1	ADDRESS2	CITY	STATE	ZIP	COUNTRY	PHONE	FAX	EMAIL	PARTY / FUNCTION
Riddell Williams P.S.	Joseph E. Shickich, Jr.	1001 4th Ave.	Suite 4500	Seattle	WA	98154-1195		206-624-3600	206-389-1708	jshickich@riddellwilliams.com	Counsel for Microsoft Corporation; Microsoft Licensing, GP
Rierner & Braunstein LLP	Mark S. Scott	Three Center Plaza		Boston	MA	02108		617-523-9000	617-880-3456	msscott@riernerlaw.com	Counsel for ICX Corporation
Robinson, McFadden & Moore, P.C.	Annemarie B. Mathews	P.O. Box 944		Columbia	SC	29202		803-779-8900	803-771-9411	amathews@robinsonlaw.com	Counsel for Blue Cross Blue Shield of South Carolina
Ropers, Majeski, Kohn & Bentley	Christopher Norgaard	515 South Flower Street	Suite 1100	Los Angeles	CA	90071		213-312-2000	213-312-2001	cnorgaard@ropers.com	Counsel for Brembo S.p.A; Bibielle S.p.A.; AP Racing
Ropes & Gray LLP	Gregory O. Kaden	One International Place		Boston	MA	02110-2624		617-951-7000	617-951-7050	gregory.kaden@ropesgray.com	Attorneys for D-J, Inc.
Russell Reynolds Associates, Inc.	Charles E. Boulbol, P.C.	26 Broadway, 17th Floor		New York	NY	10004		212-825-9457	212-825-9414	rtrack@msn.com	Counsel to Russell Reynolds Associates, Inc.
Sachnoff & Weaver, Ltd	Charles S. Schulman, Arlene N. Gelman	10 South Wacker Drive	40th Floor	Chicago	IL	60606		312-207-1000	312-207-6400	cschulman@sachnoff.com agelman@sachnoff.com	Counsel for Infineon Technologies North America Corporation
Satterlee Stephens Burke & Burke LLP	Christopher R. Belmonte	230 Park Avenue		New York	NY	10169		212-818-9200	212-818-9606	cbelmonte@ssbb.com	Counsel to Moody's Investors Service
Satterlee Stephens Burke & Burke LLP	Pamela A. Bosswick	230 Park Avenue		New York	NY	10169		212-818-9200	212-818-9606	pbosswick@ssbb.com	Counsel to Moody's Investors Service
Schiff Hardin LLP	Michael Yetnikoff	623 Fifth Avenue	28th Floor	New York	NY	10022		212-753-5000	212-753-5044	myetnikoff@schiffhardin.com	Counsel for Means Industries
Schiff Hardin LLP	William I. Kohn	6600 Sears Tower		Chicago	IL	60066		312-258-5500	312-258-5600	wkohn@schiffhardin.com	Counsel for Means Industries
Schulte Roth & Sabel LLP	James T. Bentley	919 Third Avenue		New York	NY	10022		212-756-2273	212-593-5955	james.bentley@srz.com	Counsel for Panasonic Automotive Systems Company of America
Schulte Roth & Sabel LLP	Michael L. Cook	919 Third Avenue		New York	NY	10022		212-756-2000	212-595-5955	michael.cook@srz.com	Counsel for Panasonic Automotive Systems Company of America; D.C. Capital Partners, L.P.
Schulte Roth & Sabel LLP	Carol Weiner Levy	919 Third Avenue		New York	NY	10022		212-756-2000	212-595-5955	carol.weiner.levy@srz.com	Counsel for D.C. Capital Partners, L.P.
Seyfarth Shaw LLP	Paul M. Baisier, Esq.	1545 Peachtree Street, N.E.	Suite 700	Atlanta	GA	30309-2401		404-885-1500	404-892-7056	pbaisier@seyfarth.com	Counsel to Murata Electronics North America, Inc.; Fujikura America, Inc.
Seyfarth Shaw LLP	Robert W. Dremluk, Esq.	1270 Avenue of the Americas	Suite 2500	New York	NY	10020-1801		212-218-5500	212-218-5526	rdremluk@seyfarth.com	Counsel to Murata Electronics North America, Inc.; Fujikura America, Inc.
Seyfarth Shaw LLP	William J. Hanlon	World Trade Center East	Two Seaport Lane, Suite 300	Boston	MA	02210		617-946-4800	617-946-4801	whanlon@seyfarth.com	Counsel for le Belier/LBQ Foundry S.A. de C.V.
Sheehan Phinney Bass + Green Professional Association	Steven E. Boyce	1000 Elm Street	P.O. Box 3701	Manchester	NH	03105-2347		603-627-8278	603-641-2347	sboyce@sheehan.com	Counsel for Source Electronics, Inc.
Sheldon S. Toll PLLC	Sheldon S. Toll	2000 Town Center	Suite 2550	Southfield	MI	48075		248-358-2460	248-358-2740	lawtoll@comcast.net	Counsel for Milwaukee Investment Company
Sher, Garner, Cahill, Richter, Klein & Hilbert, LLC	Robert P. Thibeaux	5353 Essen Lane	Suite 650	Baton Rouge	LA	70809		225-757-2185	225-757-7674	rthibeaux@shergarner.com	Counsel for Gulf Coast Bank & Trust Company
Sher, Garner, Cahill, Richter, Klein & Hilbert, LLC	Robert P. Thibeaux	909 Poydras Street	28th Floor	New Orleans	LA	70112-1033		504-299-2100	504-299-2300	rthibeaux@shergarner.com	Counsel for Gulf Coast Bank & Trust Company
Shipman & Goodwin LLP	Jennifer L. Adamy	One Constitution Plaza		Hartford	CT	06103-1919		860-251-5811	860-251-5218	bankruptcy@goodwin.com	Counsel to Fortune Plastics Company of Illinois, Inc.; Universal Metal Hose Co.,
Sills, Cummis Epstein & Gross, P.C.	Andrew H. Sherman	30 Rockefeller Plaza		New York	NY	10112		212-643-7000	212-643-6500	asherman@sillscummis.com	Counsel for Hewlett-Packard Financial Services Company
Sills, Cummis Epstein & Gross, P.C.	Jack M. Zackin	30 Rockefeller Plaza		New York	NY	10112		212-643-7000	212-643-6500	jzackin@sillscummis.com	Counsel for Hewlett-Packard Financial Services Company
Silver Point Capital, L.P.	Chaim J. Fortgang	Two Greenwich Plaza	1st Floor	Greenwich	CT	06830		203-542-4216	203-542-4100	cfortgang@silverpointcapital.com	Counsel for Silver Point Capital, L.P.
Simpson Thacher & Bartlett LLP	Kenneth S. Ziman, Esq.	425 Lexington Avenue		New York	NY	10017		212-455-2000	212-455-2502	cfox@stblaw.com	Counsel to JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.
Simpson Thacher & Bartlett LLP	William T. Russell, Jr., Esq.	425 Lexington Avenue		New York	NY	10017		212-455-2000	212-455-2502	cfox@stblaw.com	Counsel to JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.
Smith, Gambrell & Russell, LLP	Barbara Ellis-Monro	1230 Peachtree Street, N.E.	Suite 3100	Atlanta	GA	30309		404-815-3500	404-815-3509	bellis-monro@sgrlaw.com	Counsel for Southwire Company
Smith, Katzenstein & Furlow LLP	Kathleen M. Miller	800 Delaware Avenue, 7th Floor	P.O. Box 410	Wilmington	DE	19899		302-652-8400	302-652-8405	kmiller@skfdelaware.com	Counsel for Airgas, Inc.
Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal LLP	D. Farrington Yates	1221 Avenue of the Americas	24th Floor	New York	NY	10020		212-768-6700	212-768-6800	fyates@sonnenschein.com	Counsel for Molex, Inc. and INA USA, Inc.
Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal LLP	Jo Christine Reed	1221 Avenue of the Americas	24th Floor	New York	NY	10020		212-768-6700	212-768-6800	jcreed@sonnenschein.com	Counsel for Molex, Inc. and INA USA, Inc.

COMPANY	CONTACT	ADDRESS1	ADDRESS2	CITY	STATE	ZIP	COUNTRY	PHONE	FAX	EMAIL	PARTY / FUNCTION
Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal LLP	Robert E. Richards	8000 Sears Tower	233 South Wacker Drive	Chicago	IL	60606		312-876-8000	312-876-7934	richards@sonnenschein.com	Counsel for Molex, Inc. and INA USA, Inc.
Sony Electronics Inc.	Lloyd B. Sarakin - Chief Counsel, Finance and Credit	1 Sony Drive	MD #1 E-4	Park Ridge	NJ	07656		201-930-7483		lloyd.sarakin@am.sony.com	Counsel to Sony Electronics, Inc.
Sotiroff & Abramczyk, P.C.	Robert M. Goldi	30400 Telegraph Road	Suite 444	Bingham Farms	MI	48025		248-642-6000	248-642-9001	rgoldi@sotablaw.com	Counsel for Michigan Heritage Bank; MHB Leasing, Inc.
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.	Eric Marcks	One Maritime Plaza	Suite 300	San Francisco	CA	94111-3492			415-393-9887	emarcks@ssd.com	Counsel for Furukawa Electric Co., Ltd. And Furukawa Electric North America, APD Inc.
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.	Penn Ayers Butler	600 Hansen Way		Palo Alto	CA	94304		650-856-6500	650-843-8777	pabutler@ssd.com	Counsel for Furukawa Electric Co., Ltd. And Furukawa Electric North America, APD Inc.
Steel Technologies, Inc.	John M. Baumann	15415 Shelbyville Road		Louisville	KY	40245		502-245-0322	502-245-0542	jmbaumann@steeltechnologies.com	Counsel for Steel Technologies, Inc.
Stein, Rudser, Cohen & Magid LLP	Robert F. Kidd	825 Washington Street	Suite 200	Oakland	CA	94607		510-287-2365	510-987-8333	rkidd@srcm-law.com	Counsel for Excel Global Logistics, Inc.
Steinberg Shapiro & Clark	Mark H. Shapiro	24901 Northwestern Highway	Suite 611	Southfield	MI	48075		248-352-4700	248-352-4488	shapiro@steinbergshapiro.com	Counsel for Bing Metals Group, Inc.; Central Transport International, Inc.; Crown Enterprises, Inc.; Economy Transport, Inc.; Logistics Insight Corp (LINC); Universal Am-Can, Ltd.; Universal Toolload Services, Inc.
Sterns & Weinroth, P.C.	Jeffrey S. Posta	50 West State Street, Suite 1400	PO Box 1298	Trenton	NJ	08607-1298		609-3922100	609-392-7956	jposta@sternslaw.com	Counsel for Doosan Infracore America Corp.
Stevens & Lee, P.C.	Chester B. Salomon, Esq. Constantine D. Pourakis, Esq.	485 Madison Avenue	20th Floor	New York	NY	10022		212-319-8500	212-319-8505	cs@stevenslee.com cp@stevenslee.com	Counsel to Tonolli Canada Ltd.; VJ Technologies, Inc. and V.J. Electronix, Inc.
Stinson Morrison Hecker LLP	Mark A. Shaiken	1201 Walnut Street		Kansas City	MO	64106		816-842-8600	816-691-3495	mshaiken@stinsonmheck.com	Counsel to Thyssenkrupp Waupaca, Inc. and Thyssenkrupp Stahl Company
Stites & Harbison PLLC	Robert C. Goodrich, Jr.	424 Church Street	Suite 1800	Nashville	TN	37219		615-244-5200	615-782-2371	madison_cashman@stites.com	Counsel to Setech, Inc.
Stites & Harbison PLLC	Madison L. Cashman	424 Church Street	Suite 1800	Nashville	TN	37219		615-244-5200	615-782-2371	robert.goodrich@stites.com	Counsel to Setech, Inc.
Stites & Harbison, PLLC	W. Robinson Beard, Esq.	400 West Market Street		Louisville	KY	40202		502-681-0448	502-779-8274	wbeard@stites.com	Counsel to WAKO Electronics (USA), Inc. and Ambrake Corporation
Stroock & Stroock & Lavan, LLP	Joseph G. Minias	180 Maiden Lane		New York	NY	10038		212-806-5400	212-806-6006	jminias@stroock.com	Counsel for 975 Opdyke LP; 1401 Troy Associates Limited Partnership; 1401 Troy Associates Limited Partnership c/o Etkin Equities, Inc.; 1401 Troy Associates LP; Brighton Limited Partnership; DPS Information Services, Inc.; Etkin Management Services, Inc. and Etkin Real Properties
Stroock & Stroock & Lavan, LLP	Kristopher M. Hansen	180 Maiden Lane		New York	NY	10038		212-806-5400	212-806-6006	khansen@stroock.com	Counsel for 975 Opdyke LP; 1401 Troy Associates Limited Partnership; 1401 Troy Associates Limited Partnership c/o Etkin Equities, Inc.; 1401 Troy Associates LP; Brighton Limited Partnership; DPS Information Services, Inc.; Etkin Management Services, Inc. and Etkin Real Properties
Swidler Berlin LLP	Roger Frankel	The Washington Harbour	3000 K Street, N.W. Suite 300	Washington	DC	20007		202-424-7500	202-424-7645	rfrankel@swidlaw.com	Counsel for Sanders Lead Co.
Swidler Berlin LLP	Robert N. Steiwurtzel	The Washington Harbour	3000 K Street, N.W. Suite 300	Washington	DC	20007		202-424-7500	202-424-7645	rsteinwurtzel@swidlaw.com	Attorneys for Sanders Lead Co., Inc.
Taft, Stettinius & Hollister LLP	Richard L. Ferrell	425 Walnut Street	Suite 1800	Cincinnati	OH	45202-3957		513-381-2838		ferrell@taftlaw.com	Counsel for Wren Industries, Inc.
Thacher Proffitt & Wood LLP	Jonathan D. Forstot	Two World Financial Center		New York	NY	10281		212-912-7679	212-912-7751	jforstot@tpw.com	Counsel for TT Electronics, Plc
Thacher Proffitt & Wood LLP	Louis A. Curcio	Two World Financial Center		New York	NY	10281		212-912-7607	212-912-7751	lcurcio@tpw.com	Counsel for TT Electronics, Plc

COMPANY	CONTACT	ADDRESS1	ADDRESS2	CITY	STATE	ZIP	COUNTRY	PHONE	FAX	EMAIL	PARTY / FUNCTION
The Furukawa Electric Co., Ltd.	Mr. Tetsuhiro Niizeki	6-1 Marunouchi	2-Chrome, Chiyoda-ku	Tokyo	Japan	100-8322			81-3-3286-3919	niizeki.tetsuhiro@furukawa.co.jp	Legal Department of The Furukawa Electric Co., Ltd.
Thelen Reid & Priest LLP	David A. Lowenthal	875 Third Avenue		New York	NY	10022		212-603-2000	212-603-2001	dlowenthal@thelenreid.com	Counsel for American Finance Group, Inc. d/b/a Guaranty Capital Corporation
Thelen Reid & Priest LLP	Daniel A. Lowenthal	875 Third Avenue		New York	NY	10022		212-603-2000	212-603-2001	dlowenthal@thelenreid.com	Counsel for Oki Semiconductor Company
Thompson & Knight	Rhett G. Cambell	333 Clay Street	Suite 3300	Houston	TX	77002		713-654-1871	713-654-1871	rhett.cambell@tklaw.com	Counsel for STMicroelectronics, Inc.
Thompson & Knight LLP	John S. Brannon	1700 Pacific Avenue	Suite 300	Dallas	TX	75201		214-969-1505	214-969-1609	john.brannon@tklaw.com	Counsel for Victory Packaging
Thurman & Phillips, P.C.	Ed Phillips, Jr.	8000 IH 10 West	Suite 1000	San Antonio	TX	78230		210-341-2020	210-344-6460	ephillips@thurman-phillips.com	Counsel for Royberg, Inc. d/b/a Precision Mold & Tool and d/b/a Precision Mold and Tool Group
Todd & Levi, LLP	Jill Levi, Esq.	444 Madison Avenue	Suite 1202	New York	NY	10022		212-308-7400		jlevi@toddleivi.com	Counsel to Bank of Lincolnwood
Togut, Segal & Segal LLP	Albert Togut, Esq.	One Penn Plaza	Suite 3335	New York	NY	10119		212-594-5000	212-967-4258	bmcdonough@teamtogut.com	Conflicts counsel to Debtors
Tyler, Cooper & Alcorn, LLP	W. Joe Wilson	City Place	35th Floor	Hartford	CT	06103-3488		860-725-6200	860-278-3802	wilson@tylercooper.com	Counsel for Barnes Group, Inc.
Underberg & Kessler, LLP	Helen Zamboni	300 Bausch & Lomb Place		Rochester	NY	14604		585-258-2800	585-258-2821	hazamboni@underbergkessler.com	Counsel for McAlpin Industries, Inc.
Varnum, Riddering, Schmidt & Howlett LLP	Michael S. McElwee	Bridgewater Place	P.O. Box 353	Grand Rapids	MI	49501-0352		616-336-6827	616-336-7000	msmcelwee@varnumlaw.com	Counsel for Furukawa Electric North America APD
Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease LLP	Robert J. Sidman, Esq.	52 East Gay Street	P.O. Box 1008	Columbus	OH	43216-1008		614-464-6422	614-719-8676	rsidman@vssp.com	
Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease LLP	Tiffany Strelow Cobb	52 East Gay Street		Columbus	OH	43215		614-464-8322	614-719-4663	ts Cobb@vssp.com	Counsel for America Online, Inc. and its Subsidiaries and Affiliates
Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz	Emil A. Kleinhaus	51 West 52nd Street		New York	NY	10019-6150		212-403-1000	212-403-2000	EAKleinhaus@wlrk.com	Counsel for Capital Research and Management Company
Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz	Richard G. Mason	51 West 52nd Street		New York	NY	10019-6150		212-403-1000	212-403-2000	RGMason@wlrk.com	Counsel for Capital Research and Management Company
Waller Lansden Dortch & Davis, PLLC	David E. Lemke, Esq.	511 Union Street	Suite 2700	Nashville	TN	37219		615-244-6380	615-244-6804	david.lemke@wallerlaw.com	Counsel to Nissan North America, Inc.
Waller Lansden Dortch & Davis, PLLC	Robert J. Welhoelter, Esq.	511 Union Street	Suite 2700	Nashville	TN	37219		615-244-6380	615-244-6804	robert.welhoelter@wallerlaw.com	Counsel to Nissan North America, Inc.
Warner Norcross & Judd LLP	Stephen B. Grow	900 Fifth Third Center	111 Lyon Street, N.W.	Grand Rapids	MI	49503		616-752-2158		growsb@wnj.com	Counsel for Behr Industries Corp.
Warner Norcross & Judd LLP	Gordon J. Toering	900 Fifth Third Center	111 Lyon Street, N.W.	Grand Rapids	MI	49503		616-752-2185	616-222-2185	gtoering@wnj.com	Counsel for Robert Bosch Corporation
Warner Norcross & Judd LLP	Michael G. Cruse	2000 Town Center	Suite 2700	Southfield	MI	48075		248-784-5131	248-603-9631	mcruse@wnj.com	Counsel to Compuware Corporation
Warner Stevens, L.L.P.	Michael D. Warner	301 Commerce Street	Suite 1700	Fort Worth	TX	76102		817-810-5250	817-810-5255	bankruptcy@warnerstevens.com	Counsel for Electronic Data Systems Corp. and EDS Information Services, L.L.C.
Weiland, Golden, Smiley, Wang Ekvall & Strok, LLP	Lei Lei Wang Ekwall	650 Town Center Drive	Suite 950	Costa Mesa	CA	92626		714-966-1000	714-966-1002	lekwall@wgllp.com	Counsel for Toshiba America Electronic Components, Inc.
Weinstein, Eisen & Weiss LLP	Aram Ordubegian	1925 Century Park East	#1150	Los Angeles	CA	90067		310-203-9393	310-203-8110	aordubegian@weineisen.com	Counsel for Orbotech, Inc.
Weltman, Weinberg & Reis Co., L.P.A.	Geoffrey J. Peters	175 South Third Street	Suite 900	Columbus	OH	43215		614-857-4326	614-222-2193	gpeters@weltman.com	Counsel to Seven Seventeen Credit Union
White & Case LLP	John K. Cunningham	1155 Avenue of the Americas		New York	NY	10036-2787		212-819-8200		icunningham@whitecase.com	Counsel for Appaloosa Management, LP
White & Case LLP	Margarita Mesones-Mori	Wachovia Financial Center	200 South Biscayne Blvd., Suite 4900	Miami	FL	33131		305-371-2700	305-358-5744	mmesonesmori@whitecase.com	Counsel for Appaloosa Management, LP
Whyte, Hirschboeck Dudek S.C.	Bruce G. Arnold	555 East Wells Street	Suite 1900	Milwaukee	WI	53202-4894		414-273-2100	414-223-5000	barnold@whdlaw.com	Counsel for Schunk Graphite Technology
Winstead Sechrest & Minick P.C.	Berry D. Spears	401 Congress Avenue	Suite 2100	Austin	TX	78701		512-370-2800	512-370-2850	bspears@winstead.com	Counsel for National Instruments Corporation
Winstead Sechrest & Minick P.C.	R. Michael Farquhar	5400 Renaissance Tower	1201 Elm Street	Dallas	TX	75270		214-745-5400	214-745-5390	mfarquhar@winstead.com	Counsel for National Instruments Corporation
Winthrop Couchot Professional Corporation	Marc. J. Winthrop	660 Newport Center Drive	4th Floor	Newport Beach	CA	92660		949-720-4100	949-720-4111	mwinthrop@winthropcouchot.com	Counsel for Metal Surfaces, Inc.
Winthrop Couchot Professional Corporation	Sean A. O'Keefe	660 Newport Center Drive	4th Floor	Newport Beach	CA	92660		949-720-4100	949-720-4111	sokeefe@winthropcouchot.com	Counsel for Metal Surfaces, Inc.
WL Ross & Co., LLC	Oscar Iglesias	600 Lexington Avenue	19th Floor	New York	NY	10022		212-826-1100	212-317-4893	oiglesias@wloss.com	Counsel for WL. Ross & Co., LLC
Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, PLLC	Lillian H. Pinto	300 North Greene Street	Suite 1900	Greensboro	NC	27402		336-574-8058	336-574-4528	lpinto@wcsr.com	Counsel for Armacell
Zeichner Ellman & Krause LLP	Peter Janovsky	575 Lexington Avenue		New York	NY	10022		212-223-0400	212-753-0396	pjanovsky@zeklaw.com	Counsel for Toyota Tsusho America, Inc.

COMPANY	CONTACT	ADDRESS1	ADDRESS2	CITY	STATE	ZIP	COUNTRY	PHONE	FAX	EMAIL	PARTY / FUNCTION
Zeichner Ellman & Krause LLP	Stuart Krause	575 Lexington Avenue		New York	NY	10022		212-223-0400	212-753-0396	skrause@zeklaw.com	Counsel for Toyota Tsusho America, Inc.

EXHIBIT E

COMPANY	CONTACT	ADDRESS1	ADDRESS2	CITY	STATE	ZIP	PHONE	FAX	PARTY / FUNCTION
Akebono Corporation (North America)	Alan Swiech	34385 Twelve Mile Road		Farmington Hills	MI	48331	248-489-7406	866-609-0888	Vice President of Administration for Akebono Corporation
Arnall Golden Gregory LLP	Heath J. Vicente	171 17th Street NW	Suite 2100	Atlanta	GA	30363-1031	404-873-8682	404-8738683	Counsel to Daishinku (America) Corp. d/b/a KDS America ("Daishinku"), SBC Telecommunications, Inc. (SBC)
Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossman	Eileen McNeerney	1285 Avenue of the Americas		New York	NY	10019	212-554-1485	212-554-1444	Counsel for Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma; Public Employees's Retirement System of Mississippi; Raifeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenfornds ABP
Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossman	Mark D. Debrowski	1285 Avenue of the Americas		New York	NY	10019	212-554-1492	2125541444	Counsel for Teachers Retirement System of Oklahoma; Public Employees's Retirement System of Mississippi; Raifeisen Kapitalanlage-Gesellschaft m.b.H and Stichting Pensioenfornds ABP
Bodman LLP	Ralph E. McDowell	100 Renaissance Center	34th Floor	Detroit	MI	48243	313-393-7592	313-393-7579	Counsel for Freudenberg-NOK; General Partnership; Freudenberg-NOK, Inc.; Flextech, Inc.; Vibracoustic de Mexico, S.A. de C.V.; Lear Corporation; American Axle & Manufacturing, Inc.
Cornell University	Nancy H. Pagliaro	Office of University Counsel	300 CCC Building, Garden Avenue	Ithaca	NY	14853-2601	607-255-5124	607-254-3556	Paralegal/Counsel for Cornell University
Ettelman & Hochheiser, P.C.	Gary Ettelman	c/o Premium Cadillac	77 Main Street	New Rochelle	NY	10801	516-227-6300	516-227-6307	Counsel for Jon Ballin
Frank D. Jones		158 New York Circle Cr.		Whitesburg	KY	41858-9122			
HAL/ERC-Legal	Tillie Lim, Esq.	50 Prospect Avenue		Tarrytown	NY	10591			Counsel to Hitachi Automotive Products (USA), Inc.
Honigman, Miller, Schwartz and Cohn, LLP	E. Todd Sable	2290 First National Building	660 Woodward Avenue	Detroit	MI	48226	313-465-7548	313-465-7549	Counsel for Valeo Climate Control Corp.; Valeo Electrical Systems, Inc. - Motors and Actuators Division; Valeo Electrical Systems, Inc. - Wipers Division; Valeo Switches & Detection System, Inc.
Kutchin & Rufo, P.C.	Kerry R. Northrup	155 Federal Street	17th Floor	Boston	MA	02110-1727	617-542-3000	617-542-3001	Counsel for Parlex Corporation
Lord, Bissel & Brook	Timothy W. Brink	115 South LaSalle Street		Chicago	IL	60603	312-443-1832	312-443-896-6432	Counsel for Sedgwick Claims Management Services, Inc.
Lord, Bissel & Brook	Timothy S. McFadden	115 South LaSalle Street		Chicago	IL	60603	312-443-0370	312-896-6394	Counsel for Methode Electronics, Inc.
Lord, Bissel & Brook LLP	Kevin J. Walsh Rocco N. Covino	885 Third Avenue	26th Floor	New York	NY	10022-4802	212-947-8304 212-947-8340	212-947-1202	Counsel to Sedgwick Claims Management Services, Inc. and Methode Electronics, Inc.
Lyden, Liebenenthal & Chappell, Ltd.	Erik G. Chappell	5565 Airport Highway	Suite 101	Toledo	OH	43615	419-867-8900	419-867-8909	Counsel for Metro Fibres, Inc.
Miami-Dade County, FL	April Burch	140 West Flagler Street	Suite 1403	Miami	FL	33130	305-375-5314	305-375-1142	Paralegal Collection Specialist for Miami-Dade County
Michael Cox		Cadillac Place	3030 W. Grand Blvd., Suite 10-200	Detroit	MI	48202	313-456-0140		Attorney General for State of Michigan, Department of Treasury

COMPANY	CONTACT	ADDRESS1	ADDRESS2	CITY	STATE	ZIP	PHONE	FAX	PARTY / FUNCTION
Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Growth, Worker's Compensation Agency	Dennis J. Raternink	PO Box 30736		Lansing	MI	48909-7717	517-373-1820	517-373-2129	Assistant Attorney General for Worker's Compensation Agency
Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Growth, Worker's Compensation Agency	Michael Cox	PO Box 30736		Lansing	MI	48909-7717	517-373-1820	517-373-2129	Attorney General for Worker's Compensation Agency
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP	William C. Heuer, Esq.	101 Park Avenue		New York	NY	10178-0060	212-309-6000	212-309-6001	Counsel to Sumitomo Corporation
Office of the Chapter 13 Trustee	Camille Hope	P.O. Box 954		Macon	GA	31202	478-742-8706	478-746-4488	Office of the Chapter 13 Trustee
Peggy Housner		Cadillac Place	3030 W. Grand Blvd., Suite 10-200	Detroit	MI	48202	313-456-0140		Assistant Attorney General for State of Michigan, Department of Treasury
Pierce Atwood LLP	Keith J. Cunningham	One Monument Square		Portland	ME	04101	207-791-1100	207-791-1350	Counsel for FCI Canada, Inc.; FCI Electronics Mexido, S. de R.L. de C.V.; FCI USA, Inc.; FCI Brasil, Ltda; FCI Automotive Deutschland GmbH; FCI Italia S. p.A.
Pierce Atwood LLP	Jacob A. Manheimer	One Monument Square		Portland	ME	04101	207-791-1100	207-791-1350	Counsel for FCI Canada, Inc.; FCI Electronics Mexido, S. de R.L. de C.V.; FCI USA, Inc.; FCI Brasil, Ltda; FCI Automotive Deutschland GmbH; FCI Italia S. p.A.
Professional Technologies Services	John V. Gorman	P.O. Box #304		Frankenmuth	MI	48734	989-385-3230	989-754-7690	Corporate Secretary for Professional Technologies Services
Ropes & Gray LLP	Marc E. Hirschfield	45 Rockefeller Plaza		New York	NY	10111-0087	212-841-5700	212-841-5725	Attorneys for D-J, Inc.
Rosen Slome Marder LLP	Thomas R. Slome	333 Earle Ovington Boulevard	Suite 901	Uniondale	NY	11533	516-227-1600		Counsel for JAE Electronics, Inc.
Schafer and Weiner PLLC	Daniel Weiner	40950 Woodward Ave.	Suite 100	Bloomfield Hills	MI	48304	248-540-3340		Counsel for Dott Industries, Inc.
Schafer and Weiner PLLC	Howard Borin	40950 Woodward Ave.	Suite 100	Bloomfield Hills	MI	48304	248-540-3340		Counsel for Dott Industries, Inc.
Schafer and Weiner PLLC	Max Newman	40950 Woodward Ave.	Suite 100	Bloomfield Hills	MI	48304	248-540-3340		Counsel for Dott Industries, Inc.
Schafer and Weiner PLLC	Ryan Heilman	40950 Woodward Ave.	Suite 100	Bloomfield Hills	MI	48304	248-540-3340		Counsel for Dott Industries, Inc.
The Timpken Corporation BIC - 08	Robert Morris	1835 Dueber Ave. SW	PO Box 6927	Canton	OH	44706			Representative for Timken Corporation